

HUMANISTIC AND POLITICAL  
LITERATURE  
IN FLORENCE AND VENICE

*At the Beginning of the Quattrocento*

STUDIES IN CRITICISM AND CHRONOLOGY

BY

HANS BARON

*Research Fellow and Bibliographer  
The Newberry Library  
Chicago*

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS · CAMBRIDGE

1955

Copyright, 1955, by the President and Fellows of Harvard College

*Distributed in Great Britain by*  
Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, London

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 54-8620  
Printed in the United States of America

TO PROFESSOR WERNER JAEGER  
IN GRATITUDE FOR THE INSPIRATION  
WHICH MY STUDIES OF THE RENAISSANCE OWE  
TO HIS WORK  
H. B.





## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The plan and first draft of this book go back to the years 1945-1947 when the author, at that time a member of the Institute for Advanced Study, was occupied with a broad project of studies on the relations of politics and humanistic thought—a project of which another major part, completed in 1952, will be published in 1955 as *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance*. The author is profoundly indebted to the former Director of the Institute, Dr. Frank Aydelotte, and to Professors E. A. Lowe and Erwin Panofsky for securing for his project, in 1944/45, the Institute's patronage, without which it would have been impossible for him to embark upon the time-consuming chronological inquiries and reexaminations of the sources needed as a basis for the historical reconstruction of early Florentine Humanism. By May 1948, with the assistance of a grant from The American Council of Learned Societies, a manuscript comprising roughly Chapters I-VI of the present volume had been prepared for print. It was accepted for press, but left unpublished at that time because the author reluctantly decided that, in view of the close interdependence of his critical findings and the historical picture prepared for *Crisis*, publication of the critical volume should be postponed until the studies in preparation for *Crisis* had confirmed or modified the chronological results.

The author revised the first six chapters and composed Chapters VII-IX after he became associated with The Newberry Library in 1949. He feels deeply obliged to the Administration of the Library, and especially grateful to the Librarian, Dr. Stanley Pargellis, for extending every possible assistance to the project and particularly for allowing a generous division of the author's time between library duties and research.

Warm thanks must be expressed to Professor and Mrs. Harold S. Jantz to whose patient help in 1946 and 1947 Chapters I-VI, originally written in German, owe their present English form. In the revision of the English of the last three chapters, and in

the preparation of the final manuscript of the book, the author had the help of two of his colleagues on the staff of The Newberry Library, Mr. Fred Wieck, Editor of *The Newberry Library Bulletin* in 1950-1951, and Mr. James Wells, Curator of the Wing Foundation on the History of Printing; to both of them he owes much gratitude.

It is impossible here to list the many colleagues and librarians who, either by sending descriptions of manuscripts or by providing microfilms and photostats, made feasible the preparation of this book without repeated visits to European libraries; references to some of these kind helpers are found in the notes. The author's warmest thanks in this connection go to Professors Theodor E. Mommsen and Paul O. Kristeller. Mr. Kristeller also read a large part of the typescript, helped in the study of difficult manuscript texts, and prevented mistakes and inaccuracies, especially in the notes. Vital help was received from the Administration of the Biblioteca Vaticana; some sections of Chapter VI are principally built on the descriptions and photographic reproductions of Vatican manuscripts made at the author's request.

Dr. Charles R. D. Miller has kindly granted permission to reprint the chapter on Tommaso Mocenigo which had already been published, in a slightly different form, in *Speculum*, XXVII (1952).

H. B.

# CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION	
Literary and Political Approaches to Early Renaissance Literature: A Problem of Method	3
I GIOVANNI DA PRATO'S <i>PARADISO DEGLI ALBERTI</i>	
1. A Presumed Historical Source for the Year 1389	13
2. The <i>Paradiso</i> as Anachronistic Fifteenth-Century Fiction	27
Excursus: The Date of the <i>Paradiso</i>	34
II PUBLICISTS DURING THE FLORENTINE STRUGGLE WITH GIANGALEAZZO VISCONTI OF MILAN (1397-1402)	
1. The Date of Antonio Loschi's <i>Invectiva in Florentinos</i>	38
Excursus: Pitfalls in the Dating of Loschi's <i>Invectiva</i>	42
2. The Date of Cino Rinuccini's <i>Risponsiva alla Invertiva di Messer Antonio Luscho</i>	47
3. Two Strata in Salutati's <i>Invectiva in Antonium Luschum Vicentinum</i>	51
4. A New Chronology of the Pamphlets Accompanying the Florentine-Milanese Struggle	60
III THE DATE OF GREGORIO DATI'S <i>ISTORIA DI FIRENZE 1380-1406</i>	62
IV LEONARDO BRUNI'S <i>LAUDATIO FLORENTINAE URBS</i>	
1. Two Versions of the <i>Laudatio</i> ? A blind Alley	69
2. The Alleged Pre-1402 Origin of the <i>Laudatio</i> . A Refutation	82
Excursus: A Recent Abortive Approach to the Problems of the <i>Laudatio</i>	93
3. The Date of the <i>Laudatio</i> : Summer 1403 or Summer 1404	97
4. Salutati's <i>Invectiva</i> as a Source of Bruni's <i>Laudatio</i>	104
5. A Letter of Pier Paolo Vergerio ( <i>Epistola LXXXXVI</i> ) and Bruni's <i>Laudatio</i>	107

V	BRUNI'S DEVELOPMENT AS A TRANSLATOR FROM THE GREEK (1400-1403/04). THE DATE OF HIS <i>EPISTOLA I</i> 8	114
	Excursus: The Date of Salutati's <i>Epistola XII</i> 10	122
VI	BRUNI'S <i>DIALOGI AD PETRUM PAULUM HISTRUM</i>	
1.	A New Theory Successive Composition of the Two Dialogues in 1401 and after 1402	126
2.	One-Dialogue Manuscripts of the <i>Dialogi</i>	129
	Excursus: Cod. Vat. Lat. 1883, a One-Dialogue Manuscript of the <i>Dialogi</i> from the Council of Constance	140
3.	The Title of the <i>Dialogi</i>	145
4.	The Date of <i>Dialogus I</i>	154
	Excursus: Indications that <i>Dialogus II</i> was Written after Bruni had Left Florence	159
5.	Summary: A Reconstructed Chronology of Literature around 1400, and a New Perspective	163
VII	THE GENESIS OF BRUNI'S ANNOTATED LATIN VERSION OF THE (PSEUDO-) ARISTOTELIAN <i>ECONOMICS</i> (1420-1421)	166
VIII	AN EPISTOLARY DESCRIPTION BY BRUNI OF THE FLORENTINE CONSTITUTION IN 1413	
1.	Problems of Authenticity and Date	173
2.	An Edition of Bruni's Unpublished Letter	181
IX	THE ANTI-FLORENTINE DISCOURSES OF THE DOGE TOMMASO MOCENIGO (1422-1423)	
1.	An Apparent Monument of Anti-Florentinism in the Early Quattrocento	185
2.	A Reconstruction of a Perverted Chronology	189
3.	The Three Discourses as a Partial Forgery	197
4.	The Forger, His Bias, and the Date of the Falsification	208
5.	The Source Value of the Genuine Parts of the Discourses	213
	Index	217

HUMANISTIC AND POLITICAL  
LITERATURE  
IN FLORENCE AND VENICE  
*At the Beginning of the Quattrocento*



## INTRODUCTION

### LITERARY AND POLITICAL APPROACHES TO EARLY RENAISSANCE LITERATURE: A PROBLEM OF METHOD

After a period during which the continuity between the medieval and the Renaissance development was emphasized, attention in the study of Renaissance Italy has recently been refocused on the rapid change which, in the course of a few decades, occurred at the passing of the fourteenth century into the fifteenth. Although we shall not forget what we have learned about the organic evolution of medieval and Renaissance culture, we are returning with sharpened eyes to the examination of the undeniably new factors which on the eve and threshold of the Quattrocento entered into the crucible of Renaissance civilization.

Among these factors one must count a transformation of Italy's political conditions, then reaching an explosive stage. In the older historiography, political history seemed to contribute to an understanding of the genesis of the Renaissance little but the concept of a slow, gradual shift from the free *Commune* to autocratic *Signory*. This concept lent itself as a background to the opinion that the development of culture from the fourteenth to the fifteenth century was essentially continuous and lacked any violent mutation. The more recent approach in Renaissance historiography acknowledges more dynamic processes; it is aware of a period of transition and decision, replete with challenges, political clashes, and the emergence of new ideas.

The rise of *signory*, which had been going on from the thirteenth century, was not in reality tantamount to the uniform doom of all the free *communes*. Rather, it was producing momentous translocations leading to the coexistence of various types of Italian states. When, by the end of the fourteenth century, *signo-*

ry had engulfed nearly the whole of northern Italy, south of the Apennines "tyrants" were still few and far between, and none had succeeded in permanently establishing himself in Tuscany. In northern Italy, in the valley plain along the Po, a region which called for integrated dominion, dictatorial *signori* of powerful centers had shown their mettle by quickly subjugating weaker neighbors, other despots and free cities alike. The rise of autocratic monarchical government not only had quelled civil unrest at home, but also had created focal points for an expansion which in its consequences promised to bring to an end the ceaseless conflicts inseparable from the medieval territorial partition into countless local independencies. During the fourteenth century, it is true, the feuds of neighbors were as yet merely replaced by struggles for survival among the larger *signories* themselves. But in the year 1387-88, Giangaleazzo Visconti, Lord of Milan, by conquering the two foremost northeastern tyrant territories — of the Scaligeri of Verona and of the Carrara of Padua — succeeded in joining together such a vast expanse of the Po valley and its tributaries that northern Italy seemed to be on the verge of coalescing into a single region state — a state so powerful that, because of its military force and its attraction to the weak, it could be expected before long to press toward the south into central Italy, especially into Tuscany, which still was a country of independent city-republics loosely held together by a kind of precarious hegemony, that of the Florentine Republic. Even in central Italy, the hearts of many citizens had long been torn, and were now wavering between their cherished civic freedom and the longing, felt since Dante's time, for a mighty prince who would bring peace and unity to the Peninsula.

It may be largely because of a too narrow limitation of interest to the growth of the legal forms of institutional life that modern students could regard this highly complex development as an essentially uniform evolution of Italy from an age of *comuni* to an age of *signorie*. Seen from the perspective of the structure and articulation of the Peninsula, and contemporary political sentiment, Italy toward the end of the fourteenth century was driving



toward a decision between two possible ways into the future — toward a climactic crisis. If nothing had stopped the rapid advance of Viscontean rule at that time, Quattrocento Italy would not have become the Renaissance country which we know: a civilization built upon a family of equal states and upon the independence and competition of a number of regional centers, with Florence in a leading cultural position comparable to that of Athens in ancient Greece. Instead, the organization of Quattrocento Italy would have been centralization under a Milanese dynasty — a counterpart of the emerging unity of England, France, and Spain, but a centralized state menaced by the evils of unlimited absolutism far more than the western nation-states in which assemblies of the estates and other representative institutions maintained a measure of balance against tyrannical rule. In fact, however, this very prospect brought out the resilience and provoked the successful resistance of all those forces which would have been doomed if such had been the future. Resistance came from the surviving city-states and minor tyrannies, and revived all the ideals and traditions of civic freedom left as a legacy by the age of the *commune*. The leader of all these counterforces was destined to be Florence.

In any study of the intellectual climate of the years around 1400, therefore, a major task must be the reconstruction of the two worlds of convictions and ideals — unifying despotism and city-state freedom — then clashing in a war-filled era, in particular, one must attempt to understand the nature of the political experience and thought which, out of danger, self-assertion, and salvation, emerged in the Florentine Republic. The grasp of these historic forces, in turn, depends upon the accuracy of our knowledge of the humanistic and publicistic literature which accompanied the struggle or closely followed in its wake. But, before entering upon the delicate problems posed by the character and the chronology of the writings then appearing, we must become acquainted with the chief events which could exert a directing influence on their authors' minds.

It was in 1390, about two years after the Milanese conquest of Verona and Padua, that Florence became the rallying-point for a league of north and central Italian city-states and minor *signories* opposing Giangaleazzo's further advance by force of arms. The stalemate and uneasy peace which this first anti-Milanese union was able to effect by 1392 changed into war again in 1397-98 (the so-called Mantuan War), this time with devastating consequences for the resistance against the Visconti. When the Republic of Venice, after briefly joining the league during the war, decided to withdraw into the protection of her islands and lagoons, the allies in the Truce of Pavia in May 1398, and in the Peace of Venice in March 1400, were forced to give Giangaleazzo practically a free hand in central Italy outside the Florentine borders. Then followed an embarrassing episode in which the Florentine Republic, in defiance of a time-honored Guelph tradition, in desperation stooped to calling into Italy the army of a German king (Rupert of the Palatinate), financed by Florentine money, for an invasion of the Milanese territories from the north — only to see the German knights defeated by Giangaleazzo's Italian troops near Brescia in October 1401. Meanwhile all the minor north-Italian powers, except Bologna, had in some fashion come to terms with the all-powerful victor. By the beginning of 1402, except for Florence, all central Italy between the Apennines and the Papal State had recognized Giangaleazzo as Lord. In the summer of 1402, when even Bologna had admitted Milanese troops and recognized Giangaleazzo as *signore*, the Florentine Republic was left the last and only defender of the traditions of the Italian city-state, while Venice was still keeping aloof from the mainland struggles in the shelter of her geographic position.

Reward came to Florence for her lonely perseverance when plague unexpectedly carried Giangaleazzo Visconti away in September 1402. But this opportune death did not bring back the conditions of the fourteenth century. On the ruins of Giangaleazzo's empire, Florence and Venice built up region states of their own. Florence, by conquering Pisa on the mouth of the Arno river, acquired a territory of modest size; Venice, by occupying

the adjoining mainland, created one of the largest Italian states, which eventually included the entire northwest of the Peninsula.

Possession of these regional dominions became permanent when two further attempts at monarchical conquest of large parts of the Peninsula had come to naught. First, from 1408 to 1414, King Ladislaus of Naples expanded the rule of the south-Italian kingdom through vast provinces of central Italy; he was with difficulty restrained by a league in which Florence again played a leading part. Then, from the beginning of the 1420's onward, Filippo Maria Visconti resumed Giangaleazzo's plans. At last Venice dramatically broke with her time-honored policy of isolation and took her stand with Florence. From 1425 the two republics fought the Visconti in an association which lasted more than two decades, until, after the extinction of the Visconti family and the brief intermezzo of a Milanese Republic, the final equilibrium system of the Italian Renaissance emerged. The outcome was a far cry from the peninsular unification many had dreamed of in the Trecento, but, on the other hand, it was the necessary precondition for the development of Quattrocento Italy, on her small peninsular scale, into a prototype of the modern world—its pattern of international relations and its articulation into sovereign states.<sup>1</sup>

\*

Such were the revolutionary events one should expect to have exercised a profound influence on the political outlook of many writers of the early Renaissance. And, indeed, effects of this influence have recently been traced in several directions. Through an analysis of neglected pamphlets of Milanese and Florentine humanists, it has been shown what a vital role was played in

<sup>1</sup>For a fuller picture and appraisal of the political background of the early Renaissance, see this writer's essays, "Articulation and Unity in the Italian Renaissance and in the Modern West," in *The Quest for Political Unity in World History*, ed. S. Pargellis ("Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1942," vol. III [1944], pp. 123-138; and "A Struggle for Liberty in the Renaissance: Florence, Venice, and Milan in the Early Quattrocento," *American Historical Review*, LVIII (1953), 265-289, 544-570, henceforth cited as "A Struggle for Liberty."

Giangaleazzo's time by the conflict between the hopes for peace through unifying conquest and the desire for the salvation of civic freedom, even in the convictions and emotions of literary men.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, the roots of some of the key ideas of the historical philosophy of the Florentine Renaissance can be discerned precisely in the literature produced during the Milanese wars.<sup>3</sup> As for the situation outside Florence, the reversal of Venice's policy of isolation during the 1420's was paralleled by an incisive transformation of Venetian ideas on the balance of power and the role of the republican element in Italy — a transformation indicated in public and private Venetian documents.<sup>4</sup>

Yet when we undertake to trace more accurately and in detail the interaction thus suggested between the new ideas and the political development, we unexpectedly find ourselves caught in a labyrinth of contradictions. Whatever the fiber of the important writings of the period may seem to imply, at almost every single step facts of chronology, apparently plain and conclusive, balk the assumption of such relations.

To begin with, for three generations or more, students have accepted without question the *Paradiso degli Alberti* as evidence for the gradualness of the transition from the pattern of intellectual life in the days of Boccaccio to the outlook of the Quattrocento; this is a source which takes us, as it professes, to a cultured Florentine circle in the year 1389 — during the lighthearted days of peace, as the author maintains, which preceded the Florentine-

<sup>2</sup> See Nino Valeri's essay, *La Libertà e la Pace. Orientamenti Politici del Rinascimento Italiano* (Turin, 1942), pp. 71-80; and his comprehensive narrative of the period: *L'Italia nell' Età dei Principati dal 1343 al 1516* (in the series "Storia d'Italia," Arnaldo Mondadori Editore [Milano, 1950]), pp. 258-268.

<sup>3</sup> See Hans Baron, *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in an Age of Classicism and Tyranny* (Princeton, N. J., 1955), especially Part One, chapter 3, "A New View of Roman History and of the Florentine Past," and Part Two, "Promise and Tradition in Politico-Historical Literature about 1400," henceforth cited as *Crisis*.

<sup>4</sup> Valeri, *L'Italia*, pp. 436 ff.; Baron, "A Struggle for Liberty," pp. 559 ff., and *Crisis*, chapter 16, in the section "*Populi Liberi*: Florence and Venice Against the Visconti from the 1420's to the 1440's."

Milanese struggle. Now, in the conversations described in the *Paradiso*, we find already discussed in detail some of the new approaches to political and historical problems that are characteristic of the literature composed during, or shortly after, the years of Florence's resistance against Giangaleazzo. Here, then, there seems to be the testimony of an historical source that brusquely defies the theory of the dependence of the new ideas on the stimuli of the political events around 1400.

Apparently no less ruinous to this theory is the chronology of the Milanese and Florentine pamphlets provoked by the conflagration. The literary attack on Florence launched by the Milanese humanist Antonio Loschi is thought to have been made relatively late in the struggle, namely around 1400, and the rejoinders of Coluccio Salutati, the Florentine chancellor, and Cino Rinuccini, a Florentine citizen, are ascribed to the year 1403 when Giangaleazzo was already dead. If these dates are correct, must not the humanistic controversies be rated as the empty oratory of *litterati* pretending that their *post-festum* diatribes had actuality? Can we use such apparent paperwork as evidence for an actual clash of ideas during the struggle? Or should we rather hazard the guess that the accepted dating of these publicistic works is leading us astray?

Certainly, not everything can be in order in the situation which we encounter when turning to the earliest products of Leonardo Bruni's pen — his *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis* and his *Dialogi ad Petrum Paulum Histrum*. These humanistic works, particularly the *Laudatio*, seem clearly to reflect the spirit of the moment when the Florentine Republic, unconquered and alone, fought and survived her enemy; moreover, they seem to elaborate the politico-historical ideas which in a less developed form are found in Salutati's and Rinuccini's pamphlets. Yet, if we follow the chronology accepted today, Bruni's Florentine eulogy originated in 1400, his dialogues in 1401, and, consequently, both works must have preceded the pamphlets of the publicists, as well as the climax of the struggle. These dates become still more suspect when we consider that Bruni at the time of the completion of the

*Laudatio* was already beginning to translate Plato from the Greek, but that, in the spring of 1400, he had only just finished his Greek schooling under Chrysoloras.

Perplexing in another respect is the situation which emerges from the presumed chronology of the literary sources that illustrate the reversal of Venice's politics during the 1420's. Judging from most of the Florentine and many of the Venetian documents of the period, we must assume that the political horizon of the early Quattrocento was dominated by the antithesis between the expansionist designs of the Visconti Tyranny and the formation of a system of Italian states, in the name of *libertas Italiae* and civic solidarity, by the Florentine and Venetian republics. But in the most significant Venetian source of the period, the elaborate speeches which have come down to us as the alleged work of the Doge Tommaso Mocenigo, we find a violent and reckless hatred of Florence — the view that it was the Florentine Republic, and not the Lord of Milan, which was the imperialistic aggressor. How, then, can this apparent state of mind of a leader of Venice be reconciled with what we otherwise should have to regard as the political climate of the early Quattrocento? Are we again confronted with hidden elements which block the road to a convincing critical appraisal of our sources?

As has already been pointed out, the literature of the period around 1400 has long been studied with a prepossessing bias toward the discovery of a gradual and uniform evolution from the Trecento to the Quattrocento. It is not surprising, therefore, that certain fundamental questions have been insufficiently asked — questions which, if persistently explored, might have disclosed an unexpected quickening or deflection of the slow evolutionary processes by experiences due to the political crisis. With the awareness, familiar to present-day scholars, of the significance of the interaction between the political and the intellectual development in many periods of history, the time has come for a fresh start in the criticism of the documents on which our concept of the transition from Trecento culture to Quattrocento culture must rest. It is in this situation that the present book proposes to

reexamine the chronology and genesis of each of the works to which we have referred, in an attempt to reorganize a group of sources, fundamental for the history of the early Renaissance, into a new and coherent picture.



There remain two points requiring explanation. In the first place, in addition to the sources already noted and a number of letters whose dates are interdependent with the chronology of the contemporaneous major works, three further pieces will be examined in the course of our investigation. Gregorio Dati's well-informed *Istoria di Firenze* (discussed in Chapter III) represents the first comprehensive account of the Giangaleazzo period by a contemporary writer, and, consequently, must be placed in the group of works requiring study. Like all the other pieces, the *Istoria* has not been correctly dated until now. On close inspection, the reasons for its alleged origin "about 1410," given by the editor of the first modern edition in 1904, turn out to be of slight satisfaction; unless they are replaced by a fundamentally different approach, it is impossible to recognize the strong affinity of the latecomer, Dati, with the earlier writers of the Giangaleazzo period.

Bruni's *Epistolary Description of the Florentine Constitution in 1413* (discussed in Chapter VIII) is a text preserved apparently in a single manuscript and not yet studied. It must be added to our group since it enlarges upon one of the major themes of the *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis*. In accordance with the method followed in this book, the date of the letter is discussed in detail, and its full text is made available. Bruni's translation of the (Pseudo-) Aristotelian *Economics* (discussed in Chapter VII), on the other hand, does not directly belong among the works with which we have to deal, but is needed as a complement because the complicated history of its genesis forms an illuminating counterpart to the history of Bruni's *Dialogi* as we shall reconstruct it. Since the phases of Bruni's labors on the *Economics* can be discerned only when their chronology is accurately established, we must

assign to this work, too, its proper place. For rectifications of the dates of a considerable number of related writings by Bruni or his Florentine contemporaries between 1400 and the 1420's, the reader is referred to the second volume of *Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance*.

The other point requiring explanation is our consistent English translation of all quotations from Latin and Volgare sources, in addition to the original text printed in the notes. To scholars actively engaged in research on the Quattrocento this may appear a needless duplication. But the writer, when preparing the present critical discussions, did not intend them exclusively for students specializing in the history or literature of the Italian Renaissance. In present-day historical scholarship one finds widespread interest in all kinds of investigation into the interrelationship of political and intellectual developments. Results issuing from this trend of study in the field of the Italian Renaissance must not remain inaccessible to those who need them for comparative approaches in other branches of historical research. Nor should the possible didactic value of new methods tested in studies of Renaissance Italy be diminished by language barriers.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> On the methods and results of the studies which follow compare especially pp. 60 f., 163 ff., 187 ff., 196 f., 212 ff. below and the places listed in note 11, p. 189.



## CHAPTER I

### GIOVANNI DA PRATO'S

### PARADISO DEGLI ALBERTI

#### 1. A PRESUMED HISTORICAL SOURCE FOR THE YEAR 1389

Ever since Alessandro Wesselofsky in 1867 rescued from the dust of libraries the conversations of Florentine citizens and humanists depicted in Giovanni Gherardi da Prato's *Paradiso degli Alberti*, the discussions contained in this novel have been accepted as an historical document for the Florence of the year 1389.<sup>1</sup>

From the outset, the circumstance that Giovanni da Prato composed his work in his old age, more than a quarter century after the events,<sup>2</sup> should have occasioned the greatest caution in using it as an historical source. This caution ought to have prevailed in spite of the author's prefatory remark that he would alternate serious debates with imaginative talks just as they had succeeded each other in the actual conversations.<sup>3</sup> But Wesselofsky pre-

<sup>1</sup> *Il Paradiso degli Alberti. Ritrovi e ragionamenti del 1389. Romanzo di Giovanni da Prato*. Ed. A. Wesselofsky (Bologna, 1867) in the series "Scelta di curiosità letterarie," vols. 86<sup>1</sup>-86<sup>11</sup>, containing Wesselofsky's introduction, henceforth cited as "Wesselofsky, I" and "Wesselofsky, II," and vols. 87-88, containing the text of the *Paradiso*, henceforth cited as "*Paradiso*, I" and "*Paradiso*, II." For Wesselofsky's view of the novel as a document pertaining to the year 1389, see Wesselofsky, I, 100, 222, 225-228.

<sup>2</sup> Already noted by Wesselofsky, II, 89 f., 100. The precise time and situation are not so evident, and we must leave their identification to the Excursus "The Date of the *Paradiso*," esp. pp. 36 f. below.

<sup>3</sup> "... a me pare alcuna volta ricorrere all' una forma del dire et all' altra, quello recitando overo scrivendo, che noi già dicemo e ragionamo ... nel tempo nel quale, ora con una lietissima disputazione, ora con prob[li]ema utile e piacevole, ora con una legiadriissima causa declamando,

sented convincing evidence that the participants in the discussions — Florentines as well as some non-Florentines — had all actually been in Florence in May 1389; by tireless studies in the Florentine libraries and archives he established that the external data ascribed to them in the novel find remarkably accurate confirmation in some contemporary accounts and in their own literary works recovered from forgotten manuscripts and documents.<sup>4</sup>

On the strength of these discoveries there has been a consensus ever since that Giovanni da Prato not only used an historical event — a gathering he had attended — as background for a fictitious story, but reproduced conversations that he had actually heard in his youth and that he still remembered at the time of his writing. Relying on this inference, Renaissance scholars have been wont to use the debates contained in Giovanni's book as an historical source for the history of Florentine culture and thought in the 1380's. In almost every modern history of the early Renaissance the *Paradiso* is placed at the beginning of the developments which introduce the Quattrocento.<sup>5</sup>

---

ora con ornatissima poetica fizione liatamente quello passavamo. Il perchè, se alcuna volta noi uscendo delle gravi cose, e alcuna lieta e gioconda e piena di festa diremo, come per lo tempo advenire potrà, non fia senza alcuna espressa utilitate, ricreando l'animo nostro non altrimenti che apresso gli Etiopi sotto l'ardente sole faccia i dolcissimi e freschi giulebbi." *Paradiso*, I, 4 f.

<sup>4</sup> Wesselofsky, *passim*, esp. I, 220-228.

<sup>5</sup> The ubiquity of this evaluation of the *Paradiso* emerges from the following list of works frequently consulted on the early Renaissance: Wesselofsky, introduction to *Paradiso degli Alberti*, I, 64, 72, 76 f. (The conversation described in the novel "takes place in the midst of a literary and social transition, alternating between the unsophisticated telling of tales in the manner of the Trecento, and the abstract philosophical contests of the Renaissance ['nel mezzo di una transizione letteraria e sociale, tra il concreto novellare del secolo XIV e le astratte filosofiche tenzioni del Risorgimento']"; the *Paradiso* must be considered as a valuable "document of Florentine culture toward the end of the Trecento, and of the mind of the men responsible for its flowering ['un documento . . . della coltura fiorentina sullo scorcio del trecento, e della vita intima degli uomini che la tenevano in fiore]'). G. Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung des Classischen Alterthums*, 3rd ed. revised by M. Lehnerdt, I (1893), 184 f. ("An image of social life . . . embodying the reminiscences of a circle such as was wont to meet together around the year 1389 ['Erinnerungen eines solchen Kreises, . . . wie er

If it were not for this one graphic document we should have to look to the political pamphlets appearing during the struggle with Giangaleazzo to find the emergence of the historiographical themes of the Quattrocento. Students of the early Renaissance,

---

sich um das Jahr 1389 zusammenzufinden pflegte'] . . . Storytelling takes turn with philosophical and antiquarian conversation which popularizes the new knowledge gained from antiquity"). K. Brandi, *Die Renaissance in Florenz und Rom*, 7th ed. (1927), pp. 41-43. ("A few decades after the time of the *Decamerone*, we meet a similar company in the *Paradiso degli Alberti* of the year 1389. Here even the characters are historical personalities, just as place and time are historically fixed ['Hier sind sogar die Persönlichkeiten historisch bestimmt, wie Ort und Zeit'] . . . We are surprised to see, above all, what an important role classical antiquity is playing already. The conversation still pays homage to the opinions of the Fathers of the Church . . . Another generation ['noch eine Generation weiter'], and there is nothing one likes to hear of more than classical antiquity"). Similarly E. Walser, *Poggius Florentinus, Leben und Werke* (1914), pp. 14 f., as well as *Gesammelte Studien zur Geistesgeschichte der Renaissance* (1932), pp. 260 ff.; and P. Monnier, *Le Quattrocento*, 2nd ed. (1920), I, 142 f.

A. Della Torre, *Storia dell' Accademia Platonica di Firenze* (1902), pp. 171-184, based an entire chapter, dealing with developments which from the late Trecento prepared the way for the later learned academies, on Giovanni da Prato's words, as if his novel were a photographic record of Florentine social life or stenographic minutes of discussions held in the year 1389.

Even among more recent scholars dealing in detail with the trends and schools of early Renaissance Florence there have been no different opinions. V. Rossi, in his *Il Quattrocento*, 3rd ed. (1933), p. 20, held that the *Paradiso* stands on the crossroads between the Trecento and the Quattrocento as a "precious document of Florentine culture in the latter part of the fourteenth century ['documento prezioso della cultura fiorentina in quello scorcio del secolo'], even though it was written many years later." Only a few years ago, G. Saitta, *Il Pensiero Italiano nell' Umanesimo e nel Rinascimento*, I (1949), 130 f., stated that the *Paradiso*, used as a document for the last part of the Trecento, reveals "the crisis of ideas from which will grow a new social, literary, and educational structure"; it shows that "the Dantean tradition came to establish itself as the center by which cultured men in Tuscany oriented themselves to develop new ideas," and that there arose in the days portrayed in the *Paradiso* "the sense of criticism which gave a characteristic complexion to the end of the Trecento, the period which may be thought the real dawn of Humanism." L. Olschki, *The Genius of Italy* (1949), pp. 261 f., says that "in the early period of humanistic civilization, shortly after Petrarch's death, two different types of cultural meetings developed," the one "impressively described in *Il Paradiso degli Alberti*, . . . of a courtly character after the pattern of

if they had not had their attention diverted by the seeming evidence of the year 1389, might long since have asked and answered questions about the impact of the catastrophic happenings around 1400. But since significant aspects of the new thought seemed to have existed in the 1380's, the subsequent period was not credited with the innovation. When Wesselofsky became aware of amazingly close coincidences between some critical discussions on historical subjects in the *Paradiso* and in Salutati's *Invectiva*, he concluded that Salutati merely gave final literary expression to ideas that had long been known and discussed in learned circles since that of the *Paradiso*. Similarly, Bruni's historical criticism has been said to continue the results achieved by the group of the *Paradiso*, or by Giovanni da Prato.<sup>6</sup>

Boccaccio's Neapolitan reminiscences; the other type represented by the meetings of scholars and laymen in the Augustinian monastery of Santo Spirito," that is, the circle around the Augustinian friar Luigi Marsili.

The only scholar ever to suspect the unreliability of Giovanni da Prato's account seems to have been E. Santini, who, in his study "La Produzione Volgare di Leonardo Bruni Aretino e il suo culto per 'le tre corone fiorentine,'" *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, LX (1912), 290 f., expressed a doubt of the historicity of Giovanni's work: much of the outlook and style of the conversations, "in my opinion, is not a genuine expression of the culture of the men shown in the *Paradiso*; it is characteristic merely of the author . . . ('. . . non è, secondo noi, l'espressione sincera della coltura degli uomini che [il *Paradiso*] mette in scena, ma solo di quella dell' autore . . .')." But Santini's argument stopped short of the goal. He called Giovanni da Prato "a man entirely of the Middle Ages ('uomo completamente medievale')," because he did not recognize that many of the ideas which figures of the Trecento, especially Marsili, are made to express in the novel reveal an advanced phase of thought; and he still further complicated the problem by mistakenly assuming that Giovanni's own high estimate of the *Volgare* is expressed through the mouth of Marsili. (He confused Marsili with the Paduan philosopher, Marsilio di Santa Sofia, the actual speaker; see *Crisis*, chapter 15, note 10). Santini did not critically examine the problem crucial for an appraisal of the historicity of the *Paradiso*: the apparent appearance in the conversations of a new politico-historical outlook. As a consequence, his warning has not been heeded.

<sup>6</sup> Wesselofsky, II, 95: An attempt at historical criticism found in Salutati's *Invectiva* "had had its origin in one of the numerous discussions about that subject matter which had taken place in the gardens of the 'Paradiso' as well as in the homes of Salutati or Roberto de' Rossi [that is, in the circles described in Bruni's *Dialogi*]." (" . . . che l'idea dell' *Invectiva* abbia avuto origine in una delle tante discussioni, che intorno a siffatta materia ebbero luogo nei giardini del *Paradiso*, come in casa di Coluccio o di Roberto de' Rossi.")

One of the serious deficiencies in our knowledge of the early Renaissance has been caused by the failure of scholars, during the long time which has elapsed since Wesselofsky's discoveries, to investigate the question which of the topics of the *Paradiso* conversations could possibly have been debated in the Florence of the 1380's. But even in the absence of a comprehensive appraisal, the treatment in the novel of a number of political and historiographical themes permits some definite conclusions on the authenticity of the work as an historical source.

There can be no doubt that a warm love for political freedom and a strong interest in the history of the Roman and Florentine republics belong among the characteristic features of the *Paradiso*. In the very first of the five books, the author takes the opportunity to talk admiringly of "the zealously-guarded, sweet liberty" of the Athenians, and of the patriotism of the Roman people in the days when the *Respublica Romana* was flourishing under her

---

An example of the ensuing distortion of the early history of historical thought in the Quattrocento is the remark in A. Gaspary's influential *Geschichte der italienischen Literatur*, II (1888), 125: "with Leonardo Bruni, as earlier in the *Paradiso degli Alberti* ['wie bereits im *Paradiso degli Alberti*'], the old legends about the foundation of the Italian cities have disappeared." Even F. Novati, master of Trecento literary history, seems to have ascribed the role of a contributor to late-Trecento historical thought to Giovanni da Prato himself, for in listing, in the commentary to Salutati's *Epistolario*, IV, 347, the writers who dealt with the founding of Florence by Rome, Novati placed Giovanni before Bruni and Traversari, preceded only by such Trecento writers as Filippo Villani and Benvenuto da Imola. Continuing along this line, N. Rubinstein, in a recent paper, "The Beginnings of Political Thought in Florence," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* V (1942), 224 f., has explicitly asserted that Bruni, as a critical historical scholar, had had a precursor in the author of the *Paradiso*. "Giovanni da Prato," Rubinstein says, "was the first to apply the new critical method of the humanists to Florentine history. . . . A short time later, we find this criterion systematically applied by Leonardo Bruni in his History of Florence." Another recent example of this mode of reasoning about the *Paradiso* is the assertion by M. Di Giovanni in *Rinascita* III (1940), 631, that the characterization, given in the *Paradiso* conversations, of a certain Paulo Dugumaro as "restorer (*rinovellatore*) of the good and useful rules of algebraical calculation (*algorismo*) that had been unheard of and dead for many centuries" may be considered an early instance of the concept of "*rinascita*" and "seems to be of considerable importance because it precedes the fifteenth century."

consuls.<sup>7</sup> In the introduction to the second book, he praises the ancient Etruscan prelude to Tuscan culture. Soon afterwards the member of the group is introduced who, in the subsequent conversations, is to weave the threads of historical interests scattered through the introduction into a new historical outlook. This principal figure is Luigi Marsili († 1394), a semi-humanistic Florentine theologian and Augustinian friar whose extraordinary popularity and high renown in cultured Florence during the last quarter of the Trecento are attested by many a literary document including Bruni's *Dialogi*. It is to Marsili that his companions turn whenever their conversation touches upon political or historical themes.

The first of these inquiries deals with the question: Which form of government is best? Here Marsili sets forth a republican interpretation of Roman history, based on a criticism of the rule of the Roman emperors<sup>8</sup> — an approach which in substance is also encountered in Bruni's *Laudatio*, and which in the Quattrocento was to become characteristic of Florentine historiography. Later, in the fifth book, when the debate, after a round of philosophical and literary discussions, returns to the politico-historical field, Marsili proves himself an accomplished critic of the problems connected with the origin and early history of Florence. He would not talk about these subjects, he says, if he did not have reliable sources for his conjectures. Indeed, he has complete command of such sources. He reconstructs the history of the founding of Florence at the time of Sulla from a full knowledge and superior critical understanding of the relevant classical authors, and of the architectural remains of Roman Florence. And so effective is he, in Giovanni da Prato's presentation, that the assembled audience ends by deriding the ignorance of the medieval chroniclers and their erroneous legends.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> *Paradiso*, I, 47-48, 52-54.

<sup>8</sup> *Paradiso*, I, 224-229.

<sup>9</sup> *Paradiso*, II, 230-243. The reaction of the audience is described as follows: "When everything had been heard, all praised the probability and reliability of these conclusions and laughed at so much swindle and foolishness of some chroniclers who, little experienced and learned, and even

Obviously, it is from this last scene that a reëxamination of the genuineness of the *Paradiso* conversations must start. For an elaborate scholarly discussion such as that by Marsili on the origin of Florence cannot be feigned for the purpose of a novel, but must be, or at least echo, the work of a critical scholar. Now we have pointed out that Wesselofsky was aware that there exists a close parallel between Marsili's *Paradiso* lecture and a digression found in Salutati's *Invectiva*.<sup>10</sup> In both works the medieval claim that Caesar, founder of the Empire, was also the founder of Florence, is superseded by the theory of the founding of Florence by veterans of Sulla; and this inference is reached by a sober exposition of two classical sources of information about the early conditions in the Arno valley: the *Bellum Catilinae* of Sallust, and Cicero's second oration against Catilina. Both in the *Paradiso* and in Salutati's *Invectiva* — although there are differences in particulars — this literary criticism is preceded by references to the ruins of ancient buildings in Florence as visible testimony of her Roman origin, and is followed by a philological digression attempting to determine the origin of the name of Florence (whether "Florentia" or "Fluentia" was the primary form); here Ptolemy and Pliny are cited as the essential authorities. In other words, the parallel between the *Paradiso* and Salutati's *Invectiva* is much too close to allow us to accept as sufficient Wesselofsky's explanation that the two works are similar at some points because both authors were indebted to Marsili's teaching.

Furthermore, we must give weight to the fact that in Giovanni's

quite ignorant of these subjects, showed in their works that they had not had any Latin literary culture, and consequently no knowledge of the authentic and significant writings; accordingly, they arrived at saying many inconsidered and vain things, producing daydreams worthy of derision and great laughter." ("Udito quanto detto stato era, ciascheduno lodava il dire verisimile e approvato, e beffando le molte truffe e balure da alcuni cronichisti poco pratici e dotti, anzi ignorantissimi di queste cose, mostrando per le loro opere non avere letteratura àuta, nè cognizione per conseguente d'opere antiche e notabili; il perchè vennero a dire molte cose frivole e vane, formando suoi sogni deridevoli e da largamente beffare." P 239.)

<sup>10</sup> See above note 6. The parallel passages are Salutati's *Invectiva*, ed. Moreni (see Chapter II, section 3, note 1), pp. 24-36; and *Paradiso*, II, 230-243. Wesselofsky confronts them in his introduction, II, 219-223.

and Salutati's almost identical paragraphs on the origin of Florence we are confronted with a piece of original research, based on wide reading in the classical authors — an achievement of critical scholarship which would do honor to any humanist of the full-blown Renaissance. The results of this early specimen of historical criticism were indeed taken over by nearly every historian of the Quattrocento, in most cases with the added interpretation, initiated by Bruni in his *Laudatio*, that Florence, having been founded by veterans of Sulla in the republican era of Rome, had thereby at birth received a lasting legacy of love of freedom and of antagonism to the Empire and any kind of tyranny.<sup>11</sup>

If Giovanni da Prato's novel were to be regarded as an historical source for the year 1389, all this critical acumen and historical erudition would ultimately have to be credited to Luigi Marsili, to a fourteenth-century theologian that is, of whose critical historical scholarship no authentic source has anything to say.<sup>12</sup> On the other hand, Salutati's works, especially his humanistic

<sup>11</sup> See the discussion of "The Thesis of the Foundation of Florence by Republican Rome," *Crisis*, chapter 3; and below pp. 99 f.

<sup>12</sup> Only one source could possibly be adduced as contradicting this statement — Giannozzo Manetti's *De Illustribus Longaevis* containing the well-known biography of Niccoli in which we read that Niccoli had received from Marsili, among all sorts of humanistic and theological instruction, "a faultless mastery of Latin and a knowledge of foreign history as well as our own," that means, of oriental-Greek history as well as of Roman-Latin history. ("Latine lingue integritatem, historiarum etiam tam externarum quam nostrarum notitiam"; Cod. Vat. Urbin. Lat. 387, fol. 156r [from a photostat, corrected by collation with Cod. Vat. Palat. Lat. 1605, which seems to have been revised by Manetti himself]. The text of Manetti's biography of Niccoli is reproduced in Mehus' *Vita Ambrosii Traversarii* [Florence, 1759], pp. LXXVI-LXXVIII). But Manetti's biographical sketch was written nearly half a century after Marsili's death, when the study of history had become a mainstay of humanistic studies. (About 1440; see *Crisis*, chapter 15, note 22.) In addition, the fact that it was precisely Niccoli among the scholars of his generation who was thought to owe much to Marsili must increase our doubt in the seriousness of Marsili's historical interests; for among the outstanding Florentine humanists in the early Quattrocento, none was less concerned about history and politics than Niccoli. Our doubt grows further when we observe that Roberto de' Rossi, another of Marsili's closest disciples (so listed in Poggio's obituary on Niccoli, *Opera* [Basel, 1538], p. 271), was also strikingly unaffected by the historically-minded attitude of most of the Florentine humanists. (See



correspondence, abound with investigations of the type found in the *Invectiva*, though smaller in scope. All internal probability, therefore, would certainly tip the scales in favor of the humanistic chancellor.

We need not, however, rely on general inferences from the abilities and interests of the possible authors; with the aid of Salutati's correspondence we are in a position to trace his critical study of this very subject step by step, until eventually we find it incorporated in his *Invectiva*. In 1398 we encounter him in the endeavor to procure the source material for his reconstruction. In that year he asked a friend in northern Italy, Donato degli Albanzani in Ferrara, for appropriate references to classical authors.<sup>13</sup> From Albanzani's answer we can gather that some of the elements which were to support Salutati's conjectures in the *Invectiva* were then first brought to his attention, among them the reference, found in the available manuscripts of Pliny's *Historia Naturalis*, to "Fluentini," instead of "Florentini" <sup>14</sup> — a piece

---

*Crisis*, chapter 14, notes 64-67.) On the other hand, we have a contemporary witness on Marsili on whose knowledge we may more safely rely: the citizen Cino Rinuccini, who, in a section of his *Risponsiva* (written soon after Marsili's death), gives brief sketches of outstanding Florentines, among them Marsili. Now Cino (see p. 25 below) deals elsewhere in his *Risponsiva* with the glories of the Roman Republic, and with Rome's decay under the Emperors, in a fashion that is an exact counterpart to the discussion of the merits of Republic and Monarchy attributed to Marsili in the *Paradiso*. No one among the contemporaries, therefore, should have been more interested than Cino in Marsili's historical studies — if they ever existed. But the place given to Marsili in Cino's roster of famous Florentines is merely that of the friar-theologian who first introduced humanistic elements to the pulpit. "With such wealth of speech did he teach the people the Holy Scriptures that he included all the beautiful and useful sayings of the philosophers and poets in his sermons, to strengthen the faith, and for the conversion of sinners." ("Con sì abundantissimo parlare al popolo la Santa Iscrittura insegnò, che tutti così begli come buoni i detti de' filosofi e de' poeti in augmentatione della fede e conversione de' peccatori predicò." Ed. Moreni, p. 227.)

<sup>13</sup> Salutati, *Ep.* X 23, 1398, August 26, *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati*, "Fonti per la storia d'Italia," no. 15-18 (Rome, 1891-1905), ed. F. Novati, vol. III, pp. 324 f.

<sup>14</sup> See Albanzani's letter to Salutati and Novati's note on "Fluentini," *ibid.*, IV, 346 f.

of information which gave rise to the controversy whether the name of Florence meant "Fluentia," the settlement between the two rivers, or "Florentia," the "flowering city." On the other hand, we learn from Albanzani's answer that some of the essential particulars of Salutati's later historical criticism must have been unknown to both of them as late as 1398. For while Albanzani supplemented the note taken from Pliny with an (erroneous) reference to Livy, he did not mention Ptolemy as an additional source. Yet in Salutati's *Invectiva*, as well as in Giovanni's *Paradiso*, it is the comparison between the information found in Ptolemy and that found in Pliny which furnishes the basis for the historical inferences. Moreover, Salutati in 1398 cannot have surmised the founding of Florence by veterans of Sulla. For if this theory had been mentioned or referred to in his letter of inquiry to Albanzani,<sup>15</sup> the latter's answer would of necessity have touched upon Sallust and Cicero, the sources on which the thesis of Florence's Sullan origin is based in the *Invectiva* and in the *Paradiso*. Instead, Albanzani referred to a note in Florus' *Epitoma* which states that "Florentia" was among the towns sold at auction ("sub hasta") during the civil war between Marius and Sulla; an assertion which implies that Florence was not founded by Sulla's veterans but already existed at that time, although so modest a place that it could be "sold" by the victorious party. This being the implication, Albanzani in recommending Florus' information could not possibly have remained silent about its incompatibility with the evidence in both Sallust and Cicero — if he knew it. Once we have added that Salutati in his *Invectiva* later expressly refuted the relevance of Florus' note, by pointing out that the place referred to by Florus as "Florentia" was in fact a country-town of this name in the *Campagna* of Naples, and not the city on the Arno,<sup>16</sup> we are in a position to reconstruct accurately the chronology of Salutati's critical studies.

<sup>15</sup> This earlier letter of Salutati's has not been preserved, but that there had been a previous inquiry can be inferred from Salutati's letter of August 26, 1398 which calls the information received from Albanzani a "reply." ("Rescriptsisti, fateor. . .")

<sup>16</sup> *Invectiva*, ed. Moreni, pp. 35 f. Salutati conjectured that the town

In 1398, when he was not yet familiar with the Sulla theory, Salutati at Albanzani's suggestion examined Florus' remarks as a possible guide. Later, when Florus had proved to be a wrong lead, Salutati succeeded in arriving at a better solution by rereading two familiar authors, Sallust and Cicero. This happened probably as late as 1402 or 1403, for in July of 1403 he sent the portion of the *Invectiva* containing the discussion of the name and origin of Florence to a friend, the well-read and erudite Domenico Bandini d'Arezzo, with a request for approval or objections. The chapter which Domenico was to read, was presumably of recent date; for it would be difficult to explain why Salutati postponed the publication of his work and asked Domenico for a hurried verdict if he had arrived at his theory much earlier. In this case he would have had ample opportunity to discuss it with his friend in the course of their frequent correspondence.<sup>17</sup>

The observation that Salutati did not become familiar with the thesis of the Sullan origin of Florence until some time after 1398 is tantamount to proof that this theory cannot have been set forth by Luigi Marsili to a Florentine audience in 1389. For how could it have happened that Salutati laboriously assembled and re-interpreted his sources between 1398 and 1403 if the same sources and the same interpretation had been common knowledge in "Florentia" listed by Florus was a misreading of "Florentina" (or "Florentinum") in Campania.

<sup>17</sup> For these facts and conclusions, compare the following passage in Salutati's letter to Domenico d'Arezzo (*Ep. XIII 8*, July 21, 1403, *Epistolario* vol. III, p. 628): "Nunc autem, quia multotiens de origine civitatis Florentie me sciscitatus es rogastique quod referrem quid sentirem, feci subsequenter ex invectiva, quam feci contra quendam qui furore summo Florentinos ausus est adoriri maledictis, exemplari capitulum, quo quid ex hoc sentiam expedivi. Dicebat enim ille nos impudenter facere Florentinos genus iactare romanum, cui de his et aliis iuxta petulantiam suam respondens originem tetigi florentinam; cuius rei te decrevi participem facere, quo et de hoc sicut de illius civitatis nomine iudicaris. Sin autem, ut contingere potest per omnia discurrentibus, sicut tu, plus vel aliud noveris, rescribe confestim." On Domenico Bandini d'Arezzo's personality and works, see two articles by U. Viviani in *Atti e Memorie della Accademia Petrarca* (Arezzo), N.S. vol. XXV (1938-39), 317-326, and XXX-XXXI (1942), 89-100.

Florence for at least ten years — especially if Salutati had participated in the conversations in the villa of the Alberti in 1389, as Giovanni da Prato has it in his novel? Moreover, how could Salutati offer Domenico his theory as something original and in need of approval, and how could Domenico in his answer encourage Salutati to publish his views, if the material and the conclusions in question had long been known in every detail?

There is, among the views ascribed to Marsili in the *Paradiso*, another group of political and historical ideas for which we can find a counterpart in the work of one of the Florentine publicists about 1400. This second parallel is encountered where Marsili deals with republican freedom and monarchy and makes the observation that Rome rose to greatness in the time of the Republic and declined under the rule of the Emperors.<sup>18</sup>

Awareness of the role of republican liberty in Roman history was in itself nothing entirely novel. Apart from Petrarch's early passion for the *Respublica Romana* in his *Africa*, high estimates of republican Rome could be found in medieval books within the reach of a writer at the end of the Trecento. Aquinas, through his reading of Sallust, had recognized the great forward strides of Rome under the Republic, and in his *De Regimine Principum* referred to Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* for this perspective of Roman history; though at the same time he had warned against any generalizations, and dulled the edge of Sallust's statements in the interest of the medieval avowal of monarchy.<sup>19</sup> His Tuscan disciple, Ptolemy of Lucca, child of a central-Italian city-republic and chronicler of the history of the Tuscan towns, had, in continuing the *De Regimine*, broken away even from these reservations. Comparing the two successive phases of Roman history, Ptolemy, in the second part of *De Regimine*, no longer hesitated to praise openly the freedom of the Roman Republic and the achievements of her elective officers, the consuls.<sup>20</sup> But the crucial

<sup>18</sup> In the second book of the *Paradiso*, I, 224-229. See above note 8.

<sup>19</sup> *De Regimine Principum*, lib. I, cap. 4, that is, within the portion of the work (I 1-II 4) written by Aquinas himself.

<sup>20</sup> *De Regimine Principum*, lib. II, cap. 9, and lib. III, capitula 6, 12, that is, in the part added by Ptolemy of Lucca. The passages are quoted in *Crisis*,

point of Giovanni da Prato's argument cannot have come from this widely consulted medieval handbook of politics. The discussion of Republic and Monarchy in his novel occurs in a peculiar form. Before the court of "reason" (*ragione*), Monarchy appears, it is stated in the debate, as the superior form of government. "Experience" (*sperienza*), on the other hand, shows that in practice the "heavenly or divine men" needed to fill a throne are "almost never found"; however, free nations maintain and even extend their fortunes, as was the case in the republican period of Rome, in contrast to the ruin wrought under her emperors. This same line of reasoning also supplies the frame for the reference to the history of Rome in Cino Rinuccini's *Risponsiva*, where he endeavors to justify the principles for which the Florentine Republic had stood throughout her history. While Giovanni da Prato refutes the arguments of *ragione* by referring to the experience of Roman history, Cino refutes the "syllogisms" (*sillogizzare*) drawn from the familiar comparisons between Monarchy and God's rule of Nature and the Universe; in their stead he emphasizes the "example" (*esempio*) of civic energies flowering under the Roman Republic, and the continued thriving of republican Florence and Venice in post-Roman Italy.<sup>21</sup>

chapter 3, note 14; for Ptolemy's connection with the world of the Tuscan towns, see *ibid.*, note 13.

<sup>21</sup>*Paradiso*, I, 224-229; *Risponsiva*, ed. Moreni (see Chapter II, section 3, note 1), pp 219 f.

To a degree, the distinction between the results of abstract argument and the lessons of history had already been made by Petrarch. According to Petrarch's *Ep. fam. III* 7, (written around 1340), he was aware "how much more the Roman commonwealth had grown under the rule of many than under the rule of one; yet I know that many great men believed the happiest condition of the state to be under a single just prince: thus *autoritas* and *experientia* seem to be at war with each other." ("... quanto plus sub multorum quam sub unius imperio romana res creverit, multis tamen et magnis viris visum scio felicissimum reipublice statum esse sub uno eodemque iusto principe: ita pugnare simul *autoritas* et *experientia* videntur.") But this realization did not prompt Petrarch to attack "*autoritas*" in the name of the "*experientia*" of history; for his own experience seemed to be in favor, not of the lesson taught by Roman history, but of the "*autoritas* of many great men." "Certainly," the letter continues, "in our present political situation . . . there remains absolutely no doubt that monarchy is the

In other words, the points made by both Giovanni da Prato and Cino Rinuccini are so similar that it is hard to believe they were set forth independently of each other. Since Giovanni's novel, composed many years after the war which inspired Cino's pamphlet, could not possibly have been in Cino's hands, there remain only these alternatives: either, Cino's arguments on Republic versus Monarchy and on the historical role of the *Respublica Romana* were a written presentation of the same ideas expounded orally by Marsili that, many years later, were reproduced by Giovanni da Prato; or, the similarity of Marsili's arguments in Giovanni's novel to Cino's view of Roman history betrays the fact that Giovanni knew and used Cino's pamphlet. After the evidence just offered for Giovanni's use of *Salutati's Invektiva*, there can be little doubt where the solution lies.

Now it is true that Cino's *Risponsiva* was not a work familiar to the reading public, since not one copy of the original Latin text seems to have survived. The pamphlet has come down to us in the vernacular version of an anonymous translator who failed to put the finishing touch to his effort. But given Giovanni's close relationship to Cino in their common cult of the Volgare and of the three great writers of the Trecento—in histories of Italian literature, Giovanni is usually portrayed as the continuator of Cino's work—there is nothing strange in the assumption that Giovanni knew a half-forgotten pamphlet of his master. One may even hazard the guess that the unknown translator of Cino's work into the vernacular, to whom we owe its preservation, was

---

best form of government to gather up and restore the energies of Italy that the long fury of civil wars has scattered." ("Certe ut nostrarum rerum presens status est, in hac animorum tam implacata discordia, nulla prorsus apud nos dubitatio relinquitur, monarchiam esse optimam relegendis reparandisque viribus italis, quas longus bellorum civilium sparsit furor." Petrarca, *Le Familiari*, ed. V. Rossi, I [Florence, 1933], 116 f.) What Petrarch had in mind was an Italian Monarchy under Robert of Naples. In summation, therefore, his argument, although intrinsically similar to that of Rinuccini and Giovanni da Prato, is somewhat different in that it refers to the authority of great minds, instead of to the counsel of reason or logic, and it does not result in the republican conclusions reached in Florence at the time of the Milanese wars.

none other than Giovanni da Prato. This seems especially plausible because, as Wesselofsky inferred from similarities in the literary form, Giovanni was the Volgare translator of another work of Cino's, his *"Invettiva" against Certain Slanderers of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio*.<sup>22</sup>

## 2. THE *PARADISO* AS ANACHRONISTIC FIFTEENTH-CENTURY FICTION

Having gained the assurance that the alleged scene of 1389 incorporates the discussion of ideas of a much later date, we may now ask whether there is anything reliable at all in the ascription to the year 1389 of conversations about the significance of the Roman Republic, the greatness of the Etruscan ancestors of Tuscany, and the founding of Florence. Might it be that the alleged subject matter of the entire debate must be thought to be fictitious? This conclusion is suggested by the fact that the speaker to whom most of the cited ideas are attributed is Luigi Marsili, a semi-humanistic theologian of the Trecento who seems to have been far removed from historical studies and reinterpretations of the kind just described. On the other side of the ledger we must enter, first, the author's repeated efforts to produce the impression that he was putting into writing some experience of his youth, at the request of friends; and, second, Wesselofsky's observation that the alleged participants in the discussions were all actually present in Florence in May 1389.

We best approach the problem by inquiring whether the general political atmosphere in which the conversations are presented as having taken place is in accordance with the political situation of Florence in 1389. Obviously, the authenticity of the recounted debates on politico-historical matters is largely dependent on the nature of this setting. If, with this thought in mind, we examine the actual events of the spring of 1389, we quickly realize that the presumed background of the conversations, presenting "the glorious citizens, leaders of that great Republic, light-

<sup>22</sup> Wesselofsky, II, 52-54.

hearted and easy in their minds in the security of peace,"<sup>1</sup> is a roseate picture of bygone youth which has small resemblance to the conditions that actually confronted Florence in May 1389. From its beginnings, the year 1389 with its inevitable drift toward war was to Florentine statesmen a time of the deepest anxiety. By 1388, Giangaleazzo had succeeded in conquering the entire eastern part of the Po valley, including the territorial states of the Scaligeri of Verona and the Carrara of Padua; and in the very spring in which the conversations of the *Paradiso* are alleged to have taken place, the "leaders of that great Republic" were trying feverishly and with ever diminishing hope to stem the Milanese expansion by diplomatic means. In spite of all these efforts, only one year later — in May 1390 — Florence was embroiled in open war.<sup>2</sup>

With Giovanni's distortion of this general situation before us, how can we be sure that, in a social gathering including foreign visitors and Florentine citizens alike, any serene discussion of political subjects took place? If there were only the fact of Giovanni's dependence on Salutati's and Rinuccini's later writings, one might still try to save a remainder of Giovanni's account by assuming that there was after all some conversation in the *Paradiso* gardens dealing in a fresh manner with Roman history and the origin of Florence, though it could not have been as mature as the discussions of Salutati and Rinuccini several years later. But with the discovery that the entire political situation presupposed in the novel is unreliable, the allegedly historical setting that informs Giovanni's account begins to look like a product of his imagination.

A parallel, deserving close attention, is, that Giovanni's reference to himself as a young participant in the *Paradiso* gathering also depicts conditions historically impossible. For whereas in the *Paradiso* we read that Giovanni then still was "of tender age"

<sup>1</sup>"... i famosi cittadini, governatori di tanta repubblica, lietissimi e contenti nella pace sicura." *Paradiso*, II, 4.

<sup>2</sup>See above "Introduction," pp. 4, 6, and the analysis of the situation about 1390 in Baron, "A Struggle for Liberty," pp. 274 ff.



(*tenera etade*),<sup>3</sup> his actual birth date, according to the statements he made before the Florentine *catasto* officials in 1427 and 1430, must have been about 1360; accordingly, he was approximately thirty years old in 1389, and certainly not "of tender age." Wesselofsky noticed this contradiction, but passed it over as "a lapse of memory in old age,"<sup>4</sup> without asking what this mistake, or distortion, indicated as to the historical reliability of the novel. Even if a more recent attempt to arrive at the year 1367 for Giovanni's birth date by way of different calculation of his age were to be accepted,<sup>5</sup> the characterization of a young man of twenty-two as "of tender age" would still arouse considerable suspicion. Having established that Giovanni proceeded quite arbitrarily in depicting the alleged political position and temper of Florence at the time of the conversations, we need not hesitate to conclude that his statement about himself and his age is also an anachronism caused by the generally fictitious nature of his narrative.

From sources other than the *Paradiso* it is possible to discover a few concrete incidents that allow us to test the authenticity of Marsili's alleged historical lecture. One of them concerns Antonio degli Alberti, the host of the party gathered in the *Paradiso*, who is known as an historical personality from his own poems, some of which deal with political subjects. Among these poems is a *canzona* from the time when Antonio, long after the happy days of the gatherings in the *Paradiso* gardens, had been banished from Florence like other members of the Alberti family, and from his exile (after 1401) was entreating his cruel native city to readmit him. Quite naturally, the *canzona* written on that occasion contains the finest praise for Florence that Antonio knew. Besides extolling the liberty of the Republic, he celebrates the splendor that had fallen on Florence through her foundation by Caesar: "From proud Rome you are descended, great-hearted city, . . .

<sup>3</sup> *Paradiso*, I, 75.

<sup>4</sup> ". . . un lasso di memoria senile." Wesselofsky, II, 89 f.

<sup>5</sup> But this attempt, made by Novati, has failed to convince Lehnerdt in his revision of Voigt's *Wiederbelebung*, I<sup>4</sup> (1893), p. 186, and Rossi, *Il Quattrocento*, 3rd ed. (1933), p. 164.

image of liberty. . . . Caesar was founder of the beginning from which you took your first dignity.”<sup>6</sup> With these words, Antonio degli Alberti, unquestionably a member of the audience which is alleged to have listened to Marsili’s scorn of medieval “lies” and reconstruction of the story of Florence’s founding by Sulla’s veterans, shows himself ignorant of any refutation of the Florentine Caesar legend. How could this be explained if Marsili really had presented in the *Paradiso* gardens an account of the founding of Florence in pre-Caesarean days?

The author of another late restatement of the belief in the foundation of Florence by Caesar was, to be sure, himself not among the personalities portrayed by Giovanni da Prato in his novel, but he was sufficiently close to that circle to be also adduced as a possible witness. Filippo Villani, in 1381/82, had composed his *On the Origin of the City of Florence and on her Renowned Citizens* (*De Origine Civitatis Florentiae et Eiusdem Famosis Civibus*). In the introduction to the *Life of Dante*, included in the section on *Renowned Citizens*, he noted that “the city of Florence was founded by Caesar.”<sup>7</sup> Filippo cannot have relished this traditional opinion, for in the field of literature he was already trying his hand at a republican interpretation of history; only a few passages before, he had contended that the long decay of Florentine literature after Claudianus, allegedly the last Florentine poet in antiquity, had originated with “the decline of almost all poetry as a consequence of the pusillanimity and avarice of the Emperors.”<sup>8</sup> In 1395/96, Filippo revised his work and on that occasion subjected the *Life of Dante* to thorough alterations.<sup>9</sup> In the *Life of Salutati*, another portion of the book available in both redactions, one observes that the revisions were not under-

<sup>6</sup> “Da l’alta Roma iscese il tuo primizio, / Magnanima città . . . , / Specchio di libertate / . . . / Cesar fu fondatore di tuo inizio / Dal qual vien la tua prima dignitate.” Wesseloſky, II, 98. For the date, after 1401, compare Wesseloſky, I, 209 f., 218 f.

<sup>7</sup> “. . . Florentiae civitas per Caesarem conderetur.”

<sup>8</sup> “Caesarum pusillanimitate et avaritia omnis pene consenuit poesis.”

<sup>9</sup> See the confrontation of the two versions of Filippo’s *Vita Dantis* in *Le Vite di Dante, Petrarca e Boccaccio scritte fino al secolo decimosesto*, ed. A. Solerti (Milan, 1904), pp. 82-94; the quoted passages, *ibid.*, p. 83.

taken for reasons of style alone, but also out of a desire to keep the book abreast of the progress of the author's knowledge.<sup>10</sup> Yet in the midst of many factual alterations the statement that "the city of Florence was founded by Caesar" remained unchanged.<sup>11</sup> Now Filippo's ability to insert up-to-date accounts of Salutati's literary achievements was occasioned by the closeness of the personal relations between the two men — a friendship attested to by the fact that Salutati had looked over and corrected the first (1381/82) version of Filippo's work.<sup>12</sup> Consequently, since on the occasion of the 1395/96 revision the reference to Caesar remained untouched, we are entitled to conclude that six or seven years after 1389 not only Filippo Villani but also Salutati and his humanistic group must have been unaware that there had been any refutation of the Florentine Caesar legend.

With this last inference we have confirmed our previous results. Wherever we are in a position to consult simultaneous literary documents, the scene depicted in the *Paradiso* proves to be entirely irreconcilable with its alleged historical environment — a foreign body in what is otherwise known of the political and historical outlook of the late Trecento. As for the literary method followed in the novel, we reach the following conclusion: in spite of the historicity of the characters portrayed, the author felt completely free to change or invent their conversations on the subjects which we have examined. Giovanni knew that the attain-

<sup>10</sup> See the confrontation of the two versions of Filippo's *Vita* of Coluccio Salutati in Novati's edition of Salutati's *Epistolario*, vol. IV, pp. 487-495.

<sup>11</sup> Solerti, *Le Vite*, p. 83. There is no reason to doubt that the same is true of the treatment of the founding of Florence in the still unpublished "liber I" of Filippo's work, though the information available in print is too meager to allow a precise statement. See the list of the contents in the partial edition in *Philippi Villani Liber de Civitatis Florentiae Famosis Civibus . . . et de Florentinorum litteratura principes fere synchroni scriptores*, ed. G. C. Galletti (Florentiae, 1847), p. 4; and the analysis in G. Calò, *Filippo Villani e il Liber de origine civitatis Florentiae et eiusdem famosis civibus* (Rocca S. Casciano, 1904), pp. 94, 97 ff., showing that Filippo followed the traditional account that Florence was founded after the destruction of Fiesole through Caesar.

<sup>12</sup> Novati, in *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati*, II, 47; IV, 488. Calò, *Filippo Villani*, pp. 45 f.

ments of critical historical scholarship which he endeavored to make accessible to Volgare readers had originated with Salutati; yet he did not hesitate to put them into the mouth of Marsili, the semi-humanistic theologian and monk, rather than ascribe them to their true author, the humanistic chancellor, whose mind and work were only partly comprehensible to him. In looking back upon the years of his youth, Giovanni made Marsili, in spirit most akin to him among his former teachers, a champion of all the ideas on Florentine history and tradition that he had absorbed from varied sources in the course of his life. He called an "able historian,"<sup>13</sup> and treated as the Socrates of the *Paradiso* dialogues for all problems of political and historical philosophy, a personality whose real attainments lay in other fields: a great religious teacher to whose monastery cultured Florence flocked for ethical instruction, a preacher who earlier than others made use in the pulpit of humanistic elements, and a clerical diplomat who patriotically worked in the service of his *commune*.

To the student who wishes to use Giovanni's novel as an historical source it is of paramount importance to discern this falsification of Marsili's historical figure.<sup>14</sup> However important Marsili was as a pioneering spirit at the stage when early Humanism blended with a religious lay culture — in a "city-state theology," as Wesselofsky put it<sup>15</sup> — the fusion between humanistic studies and the citizen's historical interests characteristic of Quattrocento Florence did not originate in any cloistered cell; it had to wait for the stirring experiences in the life of the Commonwealth from the end of the 1390's onward.

As for the use of the *Paradiso* as a presumed source of information on the closing decades of the Trecento, this result means that we may avail ourselves of the fictitious conversations in

<sup>13</sup> Marsili is called "buono storico" and "perfetto oratore" in *Paradiso*, II, 231.

<sup>14</sup> This discernment is also indispensable in a critical appraisal of the small sympathetic book on Marsili by Cornelia Casari (*Notizie intorno a Luigi Marsili* [Lovere, 1900]), still the most exhaustive monograph available on Marsili and his circle.

<sup>15</sup> "Teologia del comune." Wesselofsky, I, 87.

Giovanni da Prato's novel only in such special cases in which the early origin of the ideas there set forth can be established by other evidence. In the field of political and historical thought hardly anything is found in the *Paradiso* that squares with the pattern encountered in other documents of the period preceding the events of the time of Giangaleazzo Visconti. Since, furthermore, it can be proved<sup>10</sup> that the *Paradiso* was written in the mid-1420's, that is, at the beginning of the Florentine wars with Filippo Maria Visconti, the fervid republicanism and the historical outlook characteristic of the novel may, as a rule, be thought to reflect the Florentine state of mind during the renewed struggle with Milan in the third decade of the Quattrocento.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>10</sup> See the Excursus which follows.

<sup>17</sup> Presumably one would reach results similar to ours in examining the *Paradiso* for the type of culture it describes. For instance, one of the striking characteristics of Giovanni da Prato's picture is that not only humanists and lovers of the *Volgare* but also representatives of the medieval schools—Marsilio of Santa Sofia and Biagio Pelacani of Parma, champions of Paduan Aristotelianism, and Francesco Landini, known for his role as a mathematician-philosopher of the Occamist school—harmoniously share in the intellectual intercourse in the *Paradiso* gardens, hence the impression of gradual transition from pre-humanistic to humanistic interests in a homogeneous cultured society which seems to follow both avenues with eager sympathies. Yet an original document reflecting the authentic attitude of Landini, the Occamist member of the circle, tells a different story. In a poem of Landini, *In laudem loyce Ocham*, we hear that he had been listening in a dream to his master Occam who in the most violent language was denouncing the foolish men who lost their hearts to Cicero and Seneca, prattled in the market square instead of proving their mettle in the disputations of the schools, and proudly proclaimed as their attainment a sort of Latin eloquence vastly inferior to the speech of scholars trained by traditional dialectics. (Ed. by Wesselofsky, II, 295-301, and reedited with corrections by C. Vasoli in the article to be quoted immediately, pp. 137-141). If, side by side with this bellicose outburst by a Florentine Occamist, we place the fact that contemporaneous humanists like Salutati, in his correspondence, and Bruni, in his *Dialogi*, inveigh against the empty dialectics of the Occamists so bitterly as to suggest a struggle against an actual and present danger, the real situation seems to be, as C. Vasoli, "Polemiche Occamiste," *Rinascimento*, III (1952), 119-141, esp. 122 f., has recently suggested, that Florentine lay culture in the late Trecento was influenced by Occamism more thoroughly than is generally realized, and that it was the strong Occamist tradition, rooted in the schools of the Florentine monasteries, against which Florentine humanists had to fight their way in the last quarter of the Trecento. But then we have good reason, here as in other

## Excursus

THE DATE OF THE *PARADISO*

Whatever, as a result of our criticism, the *Paradiso* has lost as a source of information on the late Trecento, it has gained as a literary work reflecting Florentine ideals and attitudes characteristic of the period in which it was written. Precisely to which phase of Florentine Quattrocento history, then, must it be assigned? At this point our criticism of the *Paradiso* calls for a supplement.

So far, only rough approximations have been proposed by scholars for the date of the *Paradiso*. As a rule, attention has been paid to the passage in the preface which states that the author was aged when starting out upon his work.<sup>1</sup> But this reference is far from providing even a minimum of precision because Giovanni Gherardi da Prato was over eighty when he died in the 1440's<sup>2</sup> and may have called himself "aged" many years before that date.

The words of the preface run: "I have definitely resolved and prepared entirely to devote and give this highly dubious remainder of my life still to be traversed (*questo dubiosissimo resto del trascorrimiento di mea etade*) to sacred friendship, in the belief that I could do no more joyful work," that is, than to compose the novel at the request of friends.<sup>3</sup> Even if we consider it improbable that an author

---

portions of Giovanni da Prato's picture, to dismiss his sweetly harmonious mixture of Trecento traditions and humanistic traits as an anachronistic and distorting glorification of bygone days.

<sup>1</sup> V. Rossi, *Storia della Letteratura Italiana per Uso dei Licei*, II<sup>8</sup> (Milan, 1924), 58: "Giovanni lo [i. e. il romanzo] compose nei primi decenni del secolo, quando già era in età avanzata." In *Il Quattrocento*<sup>8</sup> (1933), p. 197, Rossi says vaguely "lo compose in età provetta."

<sup>2</sup> According to his own notification to the *Catasto* officials, he was about seventy in 1427-1430, and he is still mentioned in the *Catasto* of 1442. See Wesselofsky, II, 69, 89 f., and (with the evidence for 1442 added) C. Guasti, *Un Disegno di Giovanni di Gherardi da Prato, poeta e architetto, concernente alla Cupola di Santa Maria del Fiore* (in Guasti's *Opere*, vol. IV [*Scritti d'Arte*], Prato, 1897), p. 307, still the best survey of the facts of Giovanni's life.

<sup>3</sup> The beginning of the novel is mutilated. The first page, containing the passage translated above and some other not wholly intelligible statements in the same vein, runs in Wesselofsky's edition: ". . . tade a' suoi disciepoli non lasciò che la pace e la caritate, e lo insieme amarsi. Per la qual cosa io, veggendo tanti divini comandamenti e conforti, mi sono nel tutto fermo e disposto che questo dubiosissimo resto del trascorrimiento di mia etade alla santissima amicizia tutto conservando, donare, parendo non più lietamente potere operare: perchè, o santissimi e dolcissimi amici, o mio unico e

who had not arrived at the end of his fifties would talk of himself in this tone, we still are left to choose a date anywhere from shortly before 1420 to a few years after 1440.

Fortunately, a more attentive consideration of the cited passage will permit us to reduce considerably the range of the possible alternatives. We can at once exclude the possibility that the unfinished state in which the manuscript of the novel has come down to us might indicate its interruption by the author's death and, accordingly, its composition during his last years, that is, about or after 1440. For in the Florentine *catasto* register of 1442 we find a note on Giovanni stating that he had lost his memory;<sup>4</sup> obviously, it was so badly impaired that he was unable to give the required information about his possessions and personal status. Consequently, the novel belongs to an earlier phase of his life. But how far must we go back?

The passage quoted from the preface reveals not only that the years had told upon the author, but another fact as well: from now on he was determined to devote himself wholly to writing; for this, as we have seen, is the "joyful work" he henceforth wants to do for his friends. Apparently, then, he had previously been engaged in occupations of broader scope than writing for a group of friends, and these occupations he was now to discontinue. For if Giovanni's activity had heretofore been limited to writing, why should he find it necessary to make such a resolution?

Now one needs only to summarize the few facts known of Giovanni's life to realize that a situation which could compel him to make precisely this decision existed during the winter of 1425-26, but apparently at no other time. A versatile personality of the kind characteristic of the Italian Renaissance, Giovanni had held varied appointments in Florence — as a jurist, a literary scholar, and an architect — without interruption from 1414 to the beginning of 1426. In 1414 and during the years immediately following, we find him charged with the rearrangement of the archives of the "*societas*" of the church Or San Michele, and serving as the organization's juridical counselor. From

sommo tesoro, o mia ferma e sacra felicitade! io entro in quello . . . ssimo e alt . . . picciol . . . ta . . . chi . . . n . . . ." *Paradiso*, I, 1. That Giovanni's promise to devote his future life to his friends means the writing of his novel, follows from two observations: Giovanni identifies the dedication of the time ahead to "sacred friendship" with the hoped for accomplishment of some "joyful work," and emphasizes repeatedly (see below note 8) that he is going to undertake the composition of his novel at the request of his friends, and that he works on it with his thoughts on them.

<sup>4</sup>He is called "fuori della memoria." Guasti, *Un Disegno di Giovanni di Gherardi*, p. 307.

1417 to October 1425 he held the Dante lectureship ("*lectura Dantis*") at the Florentine University. Simultaneously (documents from the years 1420, 1423, and February 1426 have been preserved) he had a hand in the construction of the Florentine cathedral dome, not indeed as one of the controlling architects, but as an assistant and ready substitute who cooperated by submitting models, drawings, and written criticisms. All these activities came to an end in the winter of 1425-26. In October 1425, as a consequence of Florence's financial straits during the renewed war with Milan, the Dante lectureship at the University was abolished, and in February 1426 there was a violent public clash of opinion between Giovanni and Brunelleschi over technical details in the construction of the dome. Thereafter Giovanni's name does not reappear in the preserved documents of the "*opera del duomo*." Later information about his life is limited to his three registrations in the Florentine *catasti* of 1427, 1430, and 1442; on each of these occasions he gives as his regular residence ("*per suo abitare*") a small house in Prato which he had inherited.<sup>6</sup>

These data do not leave any doubt that in 1426 Giovanni had reached the end of his Florentine career, and either in that year or shortly thereafter retired to his native Prato for the remainder of his life. Since during the years before 1414 (about which we have no information) he had still been too young to write the passage on the "highly dubious remainder of my life still to be traversed," the crisis in the winter of 1425-26 appears to be the one and only situation that fits in with the circumstances presupposed in the preface to the novel.

After his removal to Prato, Giovanni might, of course, have taken up some new career of which no information has reached us. This, however, is highly improbable when we consider his age: he was then about sixty-six. The circumstance that according to the 1442 catasto he was "very poor" ("*poverissimo*"),<sup>7</sup> also intimates that he had gone to Prato, not to start a new professional activity in his old age, but rather to live out his last years on the proceeds of his tiny property.

Like these facts from Giovanni's life, the tenor of the *Paradiso* preface seems to preclude the lapse of a substantial span of time between his departure from Florence and the moment when he started work on his novel. Once Giovanni had settled down to spend his declining years in a provincial town under most modest financial conditions, he can hardly have long continued to feel that he was a "fellow-citizen" of those leading Florentines whom he had met when lecturing, and when cooperating on the cathedral dome. Nor would it be probable in this case that he had contact with his Florentine

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 306-309.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 307.



friends while he was writing on the novel. Yet the feeling of an active relationship with the Florentine circle still colors Giovanni's introductory words. He was going to compose this book, he says, because "my heart drives me continuously to do something pleasing to those who are my fellow-citizens in this illustrious *patria* . . . , those, I mean, who are well versed in the liberal arts, and in addition devote all their time and attention to the affairs of our sacred Republic, in order to govern her with justice and maintain her in her sweet liberty."<sup>7</sup> When to this opening statement of the author's intent one adds his repeated assertion<sup>8</sup> that he undertook his portrayal of Florentine life at the advice and request of a group of friends—who can only have been the friends he won in Florence—the situation from which the novel grew presents itself as follows:

After the twofold collapse of his previous professional ambitions—his lecturing on the *Divina Commedia*, and his prolonged efforts to gain a following for his architectural ideas on the construction of the dome—Giovanni set to work on a literary contribution to Florentine culture as he understood it; either in the secret hope that his work might once more arouse the interest of those influential citizens "well versed in the liberal arts" who had thought it fitting to cancel the Dante chair at the University, or, at least, in order to continue his connection with the Florentine circle to which he still felt he belonged as a "fellow-citizen in this illustrious *patria*." The available data do not allow us to decide whether he was still in Florence when he was writing, or whether he had already entered the modest existence of his later years in Prato. However this may be, we shall not be far wrong in the assumption that work on the *Paradiso* was begun in the winter of 1425–26 or soon afterwards, and that, if the book was written in Prato, it was begun very shortly after the author's separation from Florence.

<sup>7</sup> "Iscusimi ancora il sommo desiderio che 'l mio cuore continuamente m'incende di piacere a' miei insieme cittadini di tanta nobilissima patria, sacra et alma cittade; di quelli dico che ànno nelle liberali arti àuto dotrina, anzi alle cose della nostra santa republica con somma diligenza tutto il lor tempo tengono iustissimamente quella nella dolcissima libertade governare e salvare." *Paradiso*, I, 2.

<sup>8</sup> Most emphatically in *Paradiso*, I, 3, 4. ("Io adunque pieno d'ardore seguirò il vostro disio, santissimi amici. . ." "Parmi adunque nelle cose che voi da me recitate e scritte volete, o cordialissimi amici miei. . .")

## CHAPTER II

### PUBLICISTS DURING THE FLORENTINE STRUGGLE WITH GIANGALEAZZO VISCONTI OF MILAN (1397-1402)

#### 1. THE DATE OF ANTONIO LOSCHI'S *INVECTIVA IN FLORENTINOS*

After we have struck the *Paradiso* from the list of sources for the turn of the Trecento, where do we find the earliest signs for the emergence of a new political and historical outlook?

It has already been pointed out that a shift of emphasis to the republican period of Roman history, and a bitter denunciation of the imperial Monarchy, are characteristic not merely of Bruni's *Laudatio* and Giovanni da Prato's *Paradiso*; they have a striking parallel in Cino di Francesco Rinuccini's rarely quoted *Response* to the Milanese humanist, Antonio Loschi.<sup>1</sup> We have noted also that this pamphlet of Cino's has the appearance of a less developed phase of the views of history found in the *Laudatio* where broader humanistic knowledge of the classical authors, including even Tacitus, provides a more solid foundation.<sup>2</sup> Could it be, then, that the basic historical ideas of the *Laudatio* had a prelude, not indeed in imaginary conversations in the year 1389, but in the answer of the citizen Cino Rinuccini to the Milanese propaganda?

At first sight such a hypothesis seems to be impossible for chronological reasons. We know from safe epistolary evidence

<sup>1</sup> See above pp. 25 f.; for Bruni's *Laudatio*, see p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> See above, "Introduction," p. 9. For the role of Tacitus in the *Laudatio*, see *Crisis*, chapter 3, section "A Vindication of the Roman Republic in Leonardo Bruni's Earliest Works," *passim*, esp. notes 20 ff.

that the *Invectiva* with which Salutati answered Loschi's attacks was published toward the end of the year 1403.<sup>3</sup> As to its apparent companion piece from Cino's pen, G. Voigt made the conjecture that Cino wrote at about the same time, "since in neither of the two works is the other mentioned." Although this dating has never been contested, it is clearly no more than a first tentative guess.<sup>4</sup> But there is still another circumstance that at first sight suggests a relatively late date for Cino's work. It goes without saying that both Florentine answers were written after Loschi's challenge, and the latter has generally been placed somewhere in the years 1399-1401 — that is, so late as to make it improbable that Cino's pamphlet should have been worked out and become known to Bruni before 1400 when, according to current opinion, the *Laudatio* was composed.

The point on which all these interrelated datings hinge is the traditional ascription of Loschi's attack to the later part of the

<sup>3</sup> See above p. 23 and below p. 102.

<sup>4</sup> See G. Voigt, *Wiederbelebung*, I<sup>2</sup> (1880), 204; I<sup>3</sup> (1893), 201. Klette, in the introduction to his edition of the *Dialogi* (see Chapter VI, section 1, note 3), p. 27, conjectured, like Voigt, that Salutati's and Cino's invectives were approximately simultaneous. Novati, in his commentary on Salutati's *Epistolario* (vol. II, pp. 638 f.), referred to Voigt. Previously, G. Da Schio, *Sulla vita e sugli scritti di Antonio Loschi vicentino, uomo di lettere e di stato, commentarii* (Padua, 1858), p. 61, had asserted that Cino, "who [at that time] was not in his native city, was the first to answer" ("Cino Rinuccini fiorentino, che non era in patria, fu il primo che rispose"); but possibly Da Schio merely confused Cino's *Risponsiva* with Cino's other work, his *Invettiva* (an invective against detractors of Dante and Petrarch) which according to its introduction and conclusion (Wesselofsky, II, 303 ff., 316) would appear to have been sent to a friend in Florence from abroad, provided that this fantastic frame is regarded as something more than merely a literary convention. In any case Da Schio did not contemplate any date earlier than 1399 since this, according to him, was the year of Loschi's publicistic attack to which Cino replied. (See the note which follows, and Chapter II, section 1, Excursus, note 12.) F. Flamini failed to touch upon the date of the *Risponsiva* in his essay "Gli imitatori della lirica di Dante e del 'Dolce Stil Novo'" (in his *Studi di storia letteraria italiana e straniera* [Leghorn, 1895]), which gave the first, and still best, appraisal of the historical place of Cino in the Florentine literary school continuing the traditions of Dante and Petrarch.

Milanese-Florentine struggle.<sup>5</sup> But this ascription has never been tested by any methodical attempt at correlating the presumable date to the political situation presupposed in Loschi's pamphlet. The purport of Loschi, in addition to delivering a violent invective against the Florentine ideas of liberty and of the Roman descent of Florence, was chiefly the twofold task of undermining the confidence of Florence in her allies in the war, and of frightening those allies away from Florence by impressing them with Giangaleazzo's might and appealing to their egoism. One of the major topics of the pamphlet, therefore, is a discussion of the alliances of Florence which existed at the time of Loschi's writing. Since Florence's system of alliances in the Giangaleazzo period underwent an unbroken development, from an originally large coalition to a small group of survivors, and on to the moment when Florence was left without any ally at all, Loschi's survey of Florentine allies serves as a precise indicator of the moment when his attack was written.

Aside from a reference, too vague to be utilized, to the alleged uncertainty of Bologna's loyalty, we find Loschi directing this warning to the Florentines: "What help you can hope for from the three tyrants, I do not quite see."<sup>6</sup> And from his subsequent

<sup>5</sup> That is, to the period 1399-1401. To be precise, G. Da Schio (*Sulla vita di Loschi*, p. 143) argued in favor of 1399, while Novati (*Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati*, III, 634 ff.) remained undecided between this conclusion and an inference leading to the year 1401. G. Zippel, *Giunte e correzioni* to Voigt's work (Firenze, 1897), p. 35, and V. Rossi, *Il Quattrocento*, 3rd ed., p. 67, merely referred to the alternative left by Novati. L. Pastine in his study of Loschi in *Rivista d'Italia*, XVIII, part I (1915), 851, did not enter upon the question of the date of the *Invectiva*. N. Valeri in his recent *L'Italia nell'Età dei Principati* (1950), pp. 261 f., says "The contest between liberty and tyranny culminated in the publication of two violent diatribes, written by . . . Loschi . . . and Salutati at about the time when the Viscontean troops, drunk with victory, were approaching the walls of the [Florentine] City-Republic. . . . Loschi was the first to attack. . . . Salutati replied in 1403, when the danger had been overcome . . ."; that means, Valeri assumes, that the dates of the two works are those of the climax of the war, and of the time after the decision: the years 1402 and 1403. For the preservation and edition of Loschi's work, see Chapter II, section 3, note 1.

<sup>6</sup> Loschi's *Invectiva*, as quoted in Salutati's answer, ed. Moreni, pp. 79-83. ("A tribus vero tyrannis quid auxilii sit sperandum non satis intelligo.")

remarks follows what would be self-evident even without any explanation: that the three tyrant allies of Florence were the Carrara of Padua, the Este of Ferrara, and the Gonzaga of Mantua. This one citation suffices to make it certain that Loschi's attack was launched prior to May 11, 1398. For from the Truce of Pavia concluded on that day — the event with which the Florentine system of alliances in northern Italy broke down — to the death of Giangaleazzo, there was at no time another federation between Florence and the Gonzaga; not to speak of the relationship of Florence to Padua and Ferrara, which also became unsteady after the happenings of May 1398.

Having disparaged Florence's friends in Italy, Loschi turns to a discussion of the alliance most dangerous to Milan: that of the Arno Republic with the French King. Here we meet with another definite proof that the pamphlet belongs to the time prior to May 11, 1398. For after the Truce of Pavia, the possibility of military cooperation between Florence and France was no longer a part of the diplomatic game. At the same time the reference to the French aid for Florence provides a reliable *terminus a quo*: the Florentine-French alliance had been concluded on September 29, 1396.<sup>7</sup>

What remains is to examine the evidence for the precise date, some time between October 1396, and April 1398, when Loschi worked out his pamphlet. There is, first, his warning that France, in spite of her Florentine alliance, would eventually shrink from armed intervention. However, should the French decide to invade northern Italy — thus Loschi tried to dissuade the French King from taking the action feared by Milan — they would never return home.<sup>8</sup> We may assume, therefore, that, at the time when Loschi wrote his pamphlet, July 1397 had not yet come; for in that month the French King, after considerable vacillation, appointed Bernard of Armagnac to lead a French army into Italy.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Compare the chapter "La ligue de 1396" in M. de Bouard, *Les Origines des Guerres d'Italie. La France et l'Italie au Temps du Grand Schisme d'Occident* (Paris, 1936), pp. 209 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Loschi, *Invectiva*, pp. 112 ff.

<sup>9</sup> D. M. Bueno De Mesquita, *Giangaleazzo Visconti, Duke of Milan*,

This inference is endorsed by the implications of Loschi's preceding warning to Florence: what can be expected, he says in effect, from an alliance with distant and unprepared France at a moment when a mighty Milanese army is poised to devastate your fields, and when you can hear the noise of battle almost at your walls?<sup>10</sup> Obviously, this allusion can refer only to the first weeks after the outbreak of the war, when several Milanese *condottieri* undertook devastating raids into the heart of Tuscany of just the kind mentioned by Loschi. These circumstances did not repeat themselves in the later course of the war, because the center of combat soon shifted to northern Italy, especially to the Mantuan territory, and remained there till the Truce of Pavia.<sup>11</sup> As a consequence, Loschi must have composed his pamphlet very shortly after the outbreak of the war, which fell into mid-March of 1397.

This dating is confirmed also by a remark of Salutati in a letter written years later where he says that Loschi had composed his *Invectiva* "at the beginning of the second war which we waged with the Duke of Milan."<sup>12</sup> Since Salutati, in his own *Invectiva*, calls the war of 1397-98 "the second" with Milan,<sup>13</sup> the reference in the letter, translated into terms of years and months, means that Loschi's attack was made in the latter half of March, or in April 1397.

### Excursus

#### PITFALLS IN THE DATING OF LOSCHI'S *INVECTIVA*

Since Loschi's *Invectiva in Florentinos* is the pivot on which turns the chronology of the Florentine pamphlets written in answer to the Milanese propaganda,<sup>1</sup> we should make absolutely sure that all

1351-1402 (Cambridge, 1941), p. 212, henceforth cited as: De Mesquita, *Giangualeazzo*.

<sup>10</sup> Loschi, *Invectiva*, pp. 108-111.

<sup>11</sup> See "A Struggle for Liberty," pp. 278 f.

<sup>12</sup> "Respondi cuidam magna . . . oratione, . . . qui belli secundi principio, quod cum duce Mediolani gessimus, acerrime contra commune nostrum . . . delatrat." Salutati, *Ep. XIV* 10, Febr. 1, 1405, *Epistolario* vol. IV, pp. 75 f.

<sup>13</sup> See below pp. 46, 53-55.

<sup>1</sup> See above pp. 39 f.

arguments which might be adduced against ascription of Loschi's work to 1397—the beginning of the decisive clash between Giangaleazzo and the Florentine Republic—are in error.

Theories assuming a later date have been advanced by two authoritative students of the chronology of Loschi's *Invectiva*, G. Da Schio and F. Novati.<sup>2</sup> Both relied in the last analysis on the supposed identity of some political events mentioned by Loschi with happenings of the time around 1400.

In the first place, Da Schio and Novati believed that Loschi's *Invectiva* could not possibly have originated prior to 1399 because of certain passages in Loschi's and Salutati's pamphlets concerning the port of Pisa. For Loschi threatens that Florence, having lost the use of Pisa for the import of grain, would soon be starved; and Salutati retorts that the Florentine territory is quite able to feed its population even without access to that port. Now it is true that, as long as we attempt to identify this one event in isolation, it is almost inevitable that the occupation of Pisa by Giangaleazzo in February 1399 should seem to be the occasion Loschi had in mind. But if, by starting from a general historical analysis of Loschi's work, we have once become aware that all other datable features converge on the year 1397, it quickly appears that the references to the closing of the port may equally well point—and, on closer examination, must point—to events of 1397.

The text of Loschi's warning runs: "Answer me, what places, what granaries you believe will save you from starvation?" For your territory is hardly productive of grain, and you are cut off from your Sicilian source of supply. "Realize that you are stripped of that port by which you used to live and breathe." Since supply across the Apennines is too difficult, you may be expected "to perish by hunger alone."<sup>3</sup> To this Salutati replies (and it is irrelevant here whether his words, either all or part of them, were written or complemented after the war): believe me, the fields of the Arno valley suffice. "And don't object that we have lost the port which, I admit, is most convenient for us. After all, we have fought many wars with the Pisans, and whenever we did not have the port it hurt them more than it did us." Later he adds: "But why argue about it? That war is over, and it has brought us neither famine nor high prices." As God has helped us once with a rich crop, so he may do through many years, as he did for the Hebrew people.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> See Chapter II, section 1, note 5, and below note 12.

<sup>3</sup> "Respondere vos cupio quibus e locis, quibusve de horreis inediae vestrae subveniendum esse existimatis. . ." "Sed videte eo vos portu esse privatos, quo vitam et spiritum ducere solebatis. . ." "... vos . . . fame sola . . . esse perituros." Quoted in Salutati's *Invectiva*, ed. Moreni, pp. 74 f.

<sup>4</sup> "Nec portum, quem accommodatissimum nobis fateor, ablatum nobis

From the wording of these statements we may take it that neither Loschi nor Salutati really refer to "the conquest of Pisa" (*la presa di Pisa*), as Da Schio asserted.<sup>6</sup> What they do mention is Giangaleazzo's success in preventing Florence, as she had been prevented in former wars, from using Pisa as a seaport; and also Giangaleazzo's attempt to starve the Florentine territory by the blockade. Now this was precisely the situation in the year 1397, at least in its first half. True, at that time Giangaleazzo was not yet recognized as *signore* of Pisa; but he exerted his influence through an alliance with Jacopo d'Appiano, the local Pisan lord, and this alliance was not only sufficient to keep the port closed to Florence, but even included the stationing in Pisa of Milanese troops who from this base, at the beginning of the war early in 1397, made their sallies into the upper Arno valley to add to the effect of the blockade by destroying the Florentine crops.<sup>7</sup> Under such circumstances, Loschi's warning to Florence, to give up resistance and not await starvation, would have been entirely logical and to the point.

Two years later, at the time of Giangaleazzo's recognition as *signore* of Pisa, the relation between Milan and Florence was not a war with military conflagrations ahead, as it is presupposed throughout Loschi's pamphlet. Arms had rested since the Truce of Pavia in May 1398, and although Giangaleazzo in 1399 made himself lord successively of Pisa, Siena, and Perugia, these spoils were not wrought from Florentine possessions, and did not produce any expectation of imminent new hostilities between Florence and Milan. The Truce, indeed, was followed by the Peace of Venice in March 1400,<sup>7</sup> and there was

---

obiicias. Bella quidem plurima gessimus cum Pisanis, plusque nocuit eis nos portum illum non habere, quam nobis." "Sed quid hoc disputo? Transactum est bellum illud, quod nec famem intulit, nec caritudinem nobis fecit." Ed. Moreni, p. 76.

<sup>6</sup> *Sulla Vita*, p. 143.

<sup>7</sup> See De Mesquita, *Giangaleazzo*, pp. 209, 218. According to the detailed information given by G. Scaramella, "La Dominazione Viscontea in Pisa, 1399-1405," *Studi Storici*, III (1894), 430-432, at least fifteen hundred Milanese soldiers had gradually been assembled in Pisa by January 1397. After Giangaleazzo's defeat at Mantua in August 1397, "a great part" of them were withdrawn. In January and February of 1398, after the expulsion of all Milanese troops toward the end of 1397, there was great "rejoicing" in Florence, "la quale sperò che il d'Appiano si volgesse a lei e si affrettò a tale scopo ad inviare ambasciatori a Lucca per trattare una lega, certa che Iacopo (d'Appiano) avrebbe abbandonato il suo perfido alleato."

<sup>7</sup> For the political situation in 1399, see De Mesquita, *Giangaleazzo*, pp. 246, 252, *passim*. Immediately after the Peace of Venice, on April 10, 1400, "the Florentines were granted free transit through Porto Pisano and along



no renewal of open conflict, nor even any situation pointing to the imminence of another war until, in the autumn of 1401, King Rupert's German army appeared as an ally of Florence at the exit of the Adige valley into the north-Italian plain, near Brescia.<sup>8</sup>

But if we may be certain that Loschi's threat of starvation refers to war conditions which existed prior to the Truce of May 1398, we can go even further back and conclude that Loschi's pamphlet must have been written in the early part of the preceding war, at about the time to which so many other indications are pointing. For toward the end of 1397, a temporary breach occurred in the friendship between Jacopo d'Appiano and Giangaleazzo, the Milanese troops were driven out of the Pisan territory and not readmitted for several months. It must have been during this intermezzo, the first few months of 1398, that half-starved Florence received, as Gregorio Dati tells us, another year's supply of Sicilian grain arriving from Pisa by land and on river boats plying the Arno.<sup>9</sup> From early 1398 on, therefore, Loschi could not have threatened Florence with impending starvation: his threat must have been made before, in the year 1397.

Once the apparently strongest argument in favor of a late date of Loschi's *Invectiva* has thus been recognized as inconclusive, Da Schio's and Novati's related arguments can easily be refuted. As to the Florentine alliance with Gonzaga which, Loschi tells us, was still a reality when his pamphlet was being written,<sup>10</sup> it had already ceased to exist by February 19, 1399, when Pisa submitted to Giangaleazzo, even

the Arno" for the import of grain. See the information from the Pisan Archives in Scaramella, "La Dominazione Viscontea," p. 440, n. 2.

<sup>8</sup> On these developments of 1401, see "Introduction" p. 6, and the analysis in "A Struggle for Liberty," pp. 281 f. That Loschi's pamphlet could have been written as late as the end of 1401 seems to be excluded by many of the criteria discussed on the pages which follow, and above pp. 40-42. Nevertheless, since such a solution of the problem of the date of Loschi's *Invectiva* has been proposed (as will be mentioned presently), it may be well to add that this hypothesis is also precluded by the words with which Salutati rejects Loschi's threat of starvation. Salutati's remark that "that war is over," and that Florence had been able to live through it because God had helped her with an unusually rich crop, is tantamount to an identification of the war during which Loschi had made his threat, not as that of 1401-02, but as the war of 1397-1400, for the same help of nature is described in Gregorio Dati's *Istoria* as the event which during the years 1399-1400 made Florence independent of imports from abroad and therewith thwarted Giangaleazzo's hopes just after the final incorporation of Pisa in his empire. See Dati, *Istoria* (see Chapter III, notes 2, 6), ed. Pratesi, p. 48; ed. Manni, p. 42.

<sup>9</sup> Ed. Pratesi, p. 45; ed. Manni, p. 38.

<sup>10</sup> See above p. 41 and below pp. 53 f.

though the last step in Gonzaga's change of sides, his confederation with Milan, did not take place until some time in 1399. For Francesco Gonzaga had visited Giangaleazzo, and found a warm reception at Pavia, soon after the Truce of Pavia, and in January 1399 a representative of Gonzaga was in Pavia to negotiate the details of the reconciliation; the results were ratified on February 1.<sup>11</sup> This means there is no possible basis for Da Schio's inference that Loschi's work was written during 1399 at a time when Gonzaga had not yet been reconciled with Giangaleazzo;<sup>12</sup> any attempt to harmonize Loschi's acceptance of the fact of Florentine-Gonzaga cooperation with the political conditions prevailing in and after February 1399 is doomed to failure. The mere existence of that cooperation is enough to tell us that the blockade of the Pisan port of which Loschi speaks cannot have fallen into any part of the year 1399.

With regard to Novati's suggestion that Loschi's reference to Bologna as having been in an alliance with Florence "for nine years"<sup>13</sup> might apply to the renewal of their league in April 1392, and, consequently, point to 1401 as the year of Loschi's writing, we need only say that the treaty of August 1388 had been a real alliance between the two cities, and is listed as such in the official Florentine *capituli*.<sup>14</sup> Since that treaty, then, had existed "for nine years" in 1397, we need not doubt that Loschi, as is natural, had the original conclusion of the Florentine-Bolognese league in mind. There is just as little cause for conjecturing with Novati<sup>15</sup> that "the second war" between Florence and Milan, at whose "beginning" Loschi composed his pamphlet according to a statement of Salutati in a letter of 1405,<sup>16</sup> might have been a later war than that which broke out in 1397. For Novati overlooks that in the *Invectiva* Salutati uses the term "the second war" (*bellum secundum*) precisely for the clash of 1397 and subsequent years.<sup>17</sup> He could not have done otherwise, because he uses the expression "the earlier war" (*prius bellum*)<sup>18</sup> for the Milanese-Florentine hostilities in 1390-92, and this term is also applied by Loschi to the

<sup>11</sup> See De Mesquita, *Giangaleazzo*, p. 240.

<sup>12</sup> See Da Schio, *Sulla Vita*, p. 143: Loschi's *Invectiva* "fu scritta nel 1399, dopo la presa di Pisa fatta dal Visconti, e prima che questi si rappacificasse col Gonzaga. . . . Questo tempo, fra questi termini, è stabilito da ciò che dice Coluccio nella sua risposta."

<sup>13</sup> Ed. Moreni, p. 80. See Novati, *Epistolario di Salutati*, III, 635.

<sup>14</sup> Compare De Mesquita, *Giangaleazzo*, p. 97.

<sup>15</sup> Novati, *Epistolario*, III, 634 f.

<sup>16</sup> See Chapter II, section 1, note 12.

<sup>17</sup> See above p. 42 and below pp. 53-55.

<sup>18</sup> Ed. Moreni, p. 84.

events of the same years.<sup>19</sup> On top of all our other arguments, therefore, there is the fact that Salutati himself in later years dated Loschi's pamphlet as having been written in 1397.

To sum up, we may say that in the light of an analysis of the general political situation and of Loschi's precise political aims, none of the arguments which seem to militate against the dating of Loschi's *Invectiva* in 1397 can claim validity.

## 2. THE DATE OF CINO RINUCCINI'S *RISPONSIVA ALLA INVETTIVA DI MESSER ANTONIO LUSCHO*

Having thus correlated the contemporary events in the realm of politics with the beginnings of the struggle of the publicists, we shall not find it difficult to place Cino Rinuccini's *Risponsiva alla Invettiva di Messer Antonio Luscho* in its proper setting.<sup>1</sup> Even as the moment of Loschi's writing is revealed by his critical review of the alliances of Florence, so Cino's answer can be dated from a similar list in his own pamphlet, drawn up to prove the soundness of the Florentine coalitions.

That little had changed in the inter-state situation by the time Cino composed his answer is clear from his following analysis: "We have great confidence," he says, "in those three brothers of ours whom you so much revile, namely the Lord of Padua, the Lord of Ferrara, and the Lord of Mantua." He calls them "strong, and secure through the alliance with us, and supported by our forces,"<sup>2</sup> and there is in his mind as yet no presentiment of their later withdrawal from the Florentine cause. Concerning Florentine coöperation with France we are told that, in defense of liberty, it was quite laudable for Florence to ask the French King for his help. "And eventually we have gone into confedera-

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 80, 115. The Florentine wars with Giangaleazzo are counted in the same numerical order also in the contemporary *Istoria* of Gregorio Dati, ed. Pratesi, p. 136, ed. Manni, pp. 128 f.

<sup>1</sup> For Cino Rinuccini's work, and its edition, see Chapter II, section 3, note 1 and above pp. 26 f.

<sup>2</sup> "Di quelli tre nostri fratelli, i quali tanto vilipendi, molto ci confidiamo, ciò sono, Signore di Padova, Signore di Ferrara, e Signore di Mantova"; "... forti, e forminati per la nostra lega, e dalle nostre forze suffulti. . ." *Risponsiva*, ed. Moreni, pp. 215 f.

tion with him for the extirpation of Tyranny, for the maintenance and conservation of Liberty, and for the reform of the Church."<sup>3</sup> In other words, the time of Cino's writing was the period prior to the Truce of Pavia, the event by which all these alliances were wrecked.

The only remaining problem is whether Cino's answer followed Loschi's challenge immediately, or whether we must content ourselves with delimiting its date as some time between April 1397, and the general split-up of the Florentine league after May 11, 1398. A few details of the political situation given in the *Risposta* seem to permit an accurate answer.

In the first place, the manner in which Cino refers to the Florentine treaty with France makes it improbable that he knew of the French decision, made in July 1397, to equip an army for invasion. For since this action, which was taken in answer to appeals of the Florentine emissaries to the French court, constituted a diplomatic success even more important than the conclusion of the alliance itself, it would be difficult to explain why Cino did not mention it — unless he wrote before the event. He could not have remained silent about it later, as Loschi had scoffed at the expectation that the alliance would ever lead to an armed intervention by France. There is, of course, a possibility that the French resolution of July, because of its preëminently military character, remained unknown to Cino. But in the same context we find another statement which must have been written in the period prior to July 1397. "We shall defend our city-walls, you vainglorious fellow," Cino exclaims, "and if it should be necessary, shall go down in ruins, fighting for our liberty."<sup>4</sup> These are sentiments which are entirely appropriate to the initial stage of the war when Milanese mercenaries raided Florentine territory and advanced almost to the walls of the city. Later on, when the direct danger to Florence had passed, and the thoughts of both

<sup>3</sup> "E alla perfine con lui ci siamo collegati, per la tirannia isvegliare, e per la libertà mantenere e conservare, per la Chiesa riformare." *Ibid.*, p. 216.

<sup>4</sup> "Noi, o superbo, le nostre mura difenderemo, e se fia bisogno, per la nostra libertà ruineremo nel ferro. . ." *Ibid.*, p. 216.

parties had turned to Mantuan territory as the decisive battleground, a boast of this change would have been the adroit answer.

Another observation points in the same direction: Cino's argument, though packed with references to events of the first Florentine war with Giangaleazzo in 1390-92, nowhere contains allusions to the events of the second war, except those just identified as referring to the initial Milanese raids into the heart of the Arno valley. Had he composed his answer many months after the outbreak of hostilities, it would appear strange, indeed, that he did not counter Loschi's contention of the unreliability of Florence's allies with a reference to the fact that the passage of those months had proved that Loschi's assertions had grown out of wishful thinking.

In summing up we may say, first, that there is no indication in the *Risponsiva* of any substantial lapse of time since the composition of Loschi's *Invectiva*; second, that in the *Risponsiva*, just as in Loschi's challenge, we find several details pointing to the initial phase of the war; finally, that the general tone of Cino's pamphlet fits the time of the invasion of the Florentine territory. Considering all this, we may safely state that Cino's *Risponsiva*, far from being a product of the postwar year 1403, originated as early as 1397, in the late spring or early summer, and presumably in April, May, or June of that year.

Against this clear result of our historical analysis there seems to militate one discordant fact — the observation, first made by Wesselofsky and never reconsidered, that in the review of illustrious Florentines included in Cino's *Risponsiva* the well-known musician Francesco Landini is mentioned as a man "who understood the theory as well as the practice of that art, and in his own time (*nel suo tempo*) was the best singer of sweet songs. . . ."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> "Avemo in musica Francesco, cieco del corpo, ma dell' anima alluminato, il quale così la teorica, come la pratica di quell' arte sapea, e nel suo tempo niuno fu migliore modulatore de' dolcissimi canti, d'ogni strumento sonatore, e massimamente d'organi, co' quali con piacevole dolcezza ricreava gli stanchi." *Ibid.*, pp. 238 f. See Wesselofsky, I, 251 n. 29, p. 249 n. 25. On Landini, compare L. Ellinwood, "Introduction" to his edition of *The Works of Francesco Landini*, The Mediaeval Academy, Publication no. 36 (Cambridge, Mass., 1939), pp. XIII-XVII.

Since Landini died on September 2, 1397,<sup>6</sup> this phrasing would seem to say that Cino's *Risponsiva* was written later than 1397 — even considerably later, as the retrospective “in his time” implies.

There can be no doubt how to dissolve this contradiction. Whereas it is practically impossible that so many observations on the political background, all interwoven and supporting one another, could be amiss, an isolated passage like that referring to Landini could serve as conclusive evidence only if it were found either in the author's own manuscript or in a copy clearly made immediately after the composition of the work. In the case of a work which remained unpublished and is known to us only through the medium of a translation from the Latin into the Volgare, it is easily possible either that the author himself made changes later, or that the translator, working after Landini's death, permitted himself slight alterations in order to keep the information up-to-date or, by calling him best “in his own time,” to avoid injustice to living Florentines. In addition, the general impression of the translation is not one of great accuracy or faithfulness. Under these circumstances, the reference to Landini's death is far from causing embarrassment to our conclusions. It rather gives us a warning, to be remembered in more complicated cases, not to rely on the apparent testimony of any single passage or isolated word before the document as a whole has been subjected to historical analysis.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup>Landini's tombstone showing the date is reproduced by Ellinwood, p. XVI.

<sup>7</sup>Concerning the unreliability of the translator, note Novati's verdict: what has been handed down to us of Cino's Latin work “is but a rather careless translation” (“... se non una poco diligente versione”; *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati*, III, 639).

Another plausible explanation of the puzzle of the reference to Landini as if he were dead would be the assumption that Cino at a later time inserted the catalogue of illustrious Florentines in a text otherwise written in April/June 1397. There seem, however, to be more cases revealing a possible tampering of the translator with the original text. Rather strange, for instance, is the fashion in which the preserved text of the *Risponsiva* refers to Salutati. “We have in my time my teacher (*il maestro mio*). . . Piero Coluccio” (*Risponsiva*, ed. Moreni, p. 231; on the name ‘Colucius Pierius’ used by Salutati in his younger years, see *Epistolario*, ed. Novati,

3. TWO STRATA IN SALUTATI'S *INVECTIVA* IN *ANTONIUM LUSCHUM VICENTINUM*

By assigning the pamphlets of Loschi and Cino Rinuccini to the introductory phase of the second Florentine-Milanese war (the war ended by the truce of May 1398 and the peace of March 1400), we have implicitly cast doubt upon the dating and appraisal of Salutati's *Invectiva in Antonium Luschum*.<sup>1</sup> For, although this work was published at the end of 1403 and clearly alludes to the crisis of 1402, reëxamination from the fresh perspective of its two companion works reveals some of the same traits for which we dated Loschi's and Cino's pamphlets in 1397.

Here, then, we encounter for the first time a situation which cannot be cleared up by a simple rearrangement of the sequence of our sources of information. The only possible explanation of the appearance, in the same context, of observations from the perspective of the year 1397 and of references to the time around 1402, is that Salutati's *Invectiva* was worked out in successive stages.

II, 191, IV, 149). There is no other information suggesting that Cino had ever studied under Salutati, or that he ever was a member of Salutati's literary circle; he is not mentioned in Salutati's correspondence. Moreover, Cino's pre-humanistic background makes it rather suspect that he should ever have called the humanist chancellor "my teacher." Could it be that these words, too, were inserted or adapted by the translator?

<sup>1</sup> *Invectiva Lini Colucci Salutati in Antonium Luschum Vicentinum*, ed. D. Moreni (Florence, 1826). A few sections of the *Invectiva* have been reëdited and translated into Italian by E. Garin in *Prosatori Latini del Quattrocento*, vol. 13 of the series "La Letteratura Italiana. Storia e Testi" (Milan, 1952), pp. 1-37. Garin has collated the two Florentine manuscripts used by Moreni and found that Moreni's edition had been done with great care. (See Garin's "Nota Critica," *ibid.*, p. 1127.) A critical edition of the *Invectiva*, by N. Rubinstein, is in preparation.

Loschi's work is still available only through its inclusion in Salutati's *Invectiva* where Loschi's entire text is reproduced to serve as the basis for a running commentary against it. But at least two separate manuscripts have recently been discovered by N. Rubinstein and Paul O. Kristeller (according to kind information from Prof. Kristeller) and will become accessible through Rubinstein's edition.

Cino Rinuccini's *Risponsiva* is preserved only in an unsatisfactory, in several places incomplete, contemporary translation into the Volgarè; published together with Salutati's *Invectiva* by Moreni, *op. cit.*, pp. 199-250.

Let us first make sure that we do not delude ourselves by seeing such incongruity in Salutati's work. To begin with, there can be no doubt about the late date of publication of the *Invectiva*. The correspondence of Salutati shows that the book was not finished until July 1403, that is, ten months after Giangaleazzo's death, and that it was put into circulation only in the last quarter of 1403.<sup>2</sup> In complete accordance with this epistolary information, the reader of the pamphlet repeatedly encounters passages hinting at the disappearance of the mortal danger to the Florentine Republic after her glorious fight,<sup>3</sup> or judgments passed on the life-work of Giangaleazzo as a conqueror who left devastation—remarks that could be expected only after the close of the war and the end of Giangaleazzo's career.<sup>4</sup> So strong indeed is this latter tenor that the book leaves mostly the impression described by F. Novati with the words that Salutati's work "came out a remarkable document in every respect, because all this—the immense joy felt in Florence over the sudden disappearance of her implacable enemy, her ardent desire for revenge by continuing the destruction of his family, and the attendant proud confidence in the future—is fused in this work and forms a solemn song of triumph."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> See below p. 102.

<sup>3</sup> "... respondeat tibi . . . eventus rerum, respondeat constantissimi tot laborum tolerantia nostra, et illa Florentinorum bello paccque felicitas quam Deus dignatus est nobis offensis per iniuriam indulgere." Salutati, *Invectiva*, p. 148. "Sed nondum dies venerat sua, . . . longeque minus et nobis concessum erat illud opprimere posse monstrum, quod, sicut eventus probat, certi sumus ab aeterno fuisse divino numini reservatum." *Invectiva*, p. 153.

<sup>4</sup> "Poterat omne bellum . . . in ipso conceptu contundere totamque, si voluisset, Italiam bonitate et humanitate sua summa pacis dulcedine continere. Qualiter hoc fecerit, tribus bellis quae nobis intulit, duobusque quibus Veronensem et Paduanum confecit dominos, declaravit." Salutati, *Invectiva*, pp. 186 f. "Ipse solus potuit pacem serere, totamque simul Italiam, nobis etiam faventibus, in pacis dulcedine continere . . . Cum nullum videret par stare caput, . . . de statu suo super omnes esse securus, debuit et alios reddere pari ratione securos, non omnes bello, minis, nutu, secretisque prodicionibus exterrere. Quievisset terra ante faciem eius, et moriens de se verum et aeternis celebrandum laudibus nomen, velut auctor pacis, non perpetuus belli fomes, ac deflendum omnibus reliquisset." *Invectiva*, p. 190.

<sup>5</sup> Novati, in his commentary to the *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati*, III, 636.



And yet, in other portions, the situation presupposed in the book is neither the end of war and danger, nor the lonely stand which Florence had experienced in Giangaleazzo's last year, but, precisely as in Loschi's and Cino Rinuccini's pamphlets, the Florentine leadership of a large coalition; and, in fact, the justification of Florence's policies in building up this coalition is among the major tasks of Salutati's *Invectiva*. "With nobody," Salutati boasts, "is an alliance more eagerly sought in Italy than with the Florentine people. Nothing is more disturbing to your Lord, or to the enemies of liberty, than . . . our alliances and coalitions."<sup>6</sup> As in the other two pamphlets, the anti-Viscontean league depicted in such paragraphs still shows the composition which identifies the time before the Truce of Pavia in May 1398. For the "three tyrants"—the Carrara of Padua, the Este of Ferrara, and the Gonzaga of Mantua—whom Loschi had tried to separate from Florence by sowing distrust, are Florence's allies, and Salutati tells his adversary that these friends would not desert Florence "in this second war" with the Visconti.<sup>7</sup> The French King also is still Florence's ally; in fact, the largest single portion of Salutati's work is devoted to the justification of Florentine coöperation in the French invasion plans.<sup>8</sup> The only difference between Salutati and Cino Rinuccini is that in Salutati's reasoning there sounds a certain apprehension which makes us feel that the Gonzaga has already given some signs of wavering; this means that Salutati's comment cannot have been made quite as early as that of Rinuccini, but falls shortly before the Truce of Pavia, when Florence's affiliation with the Gonzaga was dissolved.<sup>9</sup> That

<sup>6</sup> "Nullius magis [societas] appetitur in Italia, quam populi Florentini. Nihil magis domino tuo, vel libertatis hostibus odiosum est, quam nostra potentia, quam nostrae societates et foedera . . ." *Invectiva*, p. 87.

<sup>7</sup> Reference is made to the Este of Ferrara as Florence's ally, *ibid.*, p. 85; to the Gonzaga of Mantua, p. 130. ("Interroga . . . quid faciamus. Resistimus, . . . hostes propulsamus . . . ; socio nostro domino Mantuano magnam . . . exercitus nostri manum et auxilia sociorum . . . , ne se desertum sentiat, destinamus") In addition, see the paragraph in defense of the alliance with the "tres tyranni" quoted below in note 9.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 119 ff., 123 f., 139, 154 ff., 163 ff.

<sup>9</sup> This anxiety seems to be evident in the following principal paragraph

the spring of 1398 was not far off is also proved by Salutati's knowledge of some war events of the autumn of 1397, especially the victory of Carlo Malatesta over the Milanese *condottiere*, Jacopo del Verme, at Governolo in August 1397.<sup>10</sup> This indicates that Salutati worked on the draft of an answer about half a year later than Cino Rinuccini who did not yet know of the event at Governolo. Cino, therefore, remains the earliest among the Florentine publicists of the period; but Salutati, with certain portions of his work at least, followed only a few months later.

As these examples suggest, Salutati's *Invectiva* is not an integrated work, but rather a succession of frequently contradictory paragraphs, or even contradictory sentences, written at different stages of the war. For instance: in open contrast to the statement

---

on the "tres tyranni" (though, on the other hand, the statement, like that on p. 130, just quoted in note 7, leaves no doubt that the Gonzaga cannot yet have been on the side of Milan at the time when Salutati worked on his first draft): "Credis ne quod oblitus sit illustris dominus Marchio [that is, the Este], licet, ut secundum tempora, quibus loqueris, nos loquamur [ut secundum—loquamur is obviously an editorial insertion from the time of publication], adhuc puer sit; credisne inquam, quod non agnoscat, et non recorderetur cuius favoribus consanguineus eius fines suos invaserit . . . ? Crede mihi, recordabitur, et gratitudine mutua, tam praesentis, maximique beneficii stante memoria, non deseret socios praesentes suos. Non dabitur, crede mihi, heros inclitus Patavinus [meaning the Carrara] in tam reprobum sensum, quod eos, a quibus principium habuerunt dominationis . . . maiores sui, quos nuper sensit sibi tam . . . amicos, . . . periculo suo relinquens ex parte perfidiae se domini tui committat. Nec circumspectissimus dominus Mantuanus [the Gonzaga], qui novit dominum tuum quod dicat, qui tecum non est, contra me est, . . . adeo demens erit, quod se deserat, vel sociorum defensionem, quae sua sit, omittat. Et licet medio belli sit flagraturus incendio, non implorabit frustra Florentinam opem, qui noverunt, et solent etiam suae defensionis anxii oppressis sociis subvenire, sicut olim patuit, subventionem Bononiensium *primo bello*, et sicut effectus docuit *hoc secundo* [namely, about the time of the battle of Governolo, August 1397]." *Ibid.*, 106-108. It should be added that Francesco Gonzaga's wavering began in December 1397 (see De Mesquita, *Giangaleazzo*, p. 221), while, in November, Giangaleazzo had made his first attempts to destroy the Florentine league from within by inducing the lesser members to desert Florence (De Mesquita, p. 216). Accordingly, the above passages must have been drafted between November 1397, and the Truce of Pavia in May 1398.

<sup>10</sup> *Invectiva*, ed. Moreni, p. 131, and the passages quoted in Chapter IV, section 4, notes 5, 6.

that Salutati was writing in "this second war" <sup>11</sup> — that is between March 1397, and March 1400 — elsewhere we find a remark, obviously written after 1402, that Florence had waged *three* wars against Giangaleazzo.<sup>12</sup> Again: besides many pages defending the alliances of Florence before their disruption by the Truce of Pavia, we find the comment that the *Signoria* of Venice "with whom we were allied at that time" had forced the Duke to conclude the Truce of Pavia and the Peace of Venice.<sup>13</sup> And finally: side by side with Salutati's confident assertions that Florence's long established friendship with Bologna was so natural and inevitable that it could not be undermined,<sup>14</sup> there are sneers against this sister-republic referring to suspected machinations with Milan of some Bolognese citizens in the autumn of 1397,<sup>15</sup> and laments over Bologna's defection and her subjection to Giangaleazzo's tyranny in June and July of 1402.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>11</sup> "Hoc secundo [bello]." *Ibid.*, p. 108. See the quotation above in note 9.

<sup>12</sup> See the quotation above in note 4.

<sup>13</sup> "... in manibus incliti domini Venetorum, cuius fuimus illo tempore colligati, temporales inducias primo, pacemque postremo consensit." *Ibid.*, p. 176.

<sup>14</sup> Salutati replies: If Loschi asserts "Bononienses sine bellorum onere remansuros fuisse, si se nostris a foederibus abscidissent," one may rightly ask: "tutiores, ergo, ne fuissent soli quam sociati? . . . Velim Bononienses interroges an . . . ius habeant, ut nos spe pacis, quam eos habere potuissent *priore bello* . . . fingis, *vel hoc* habituros fore promiseris, nos relinquant. An eis nostra superbia fuerit invisa, qui, priusquam societas inita finem acciperet, nobiscum aliam contraxerunt? An qui tam avide societatis nostrae foedera renovaverunt, tibi fuisse videntur nostris tergiversationibus satiati? Vel spem ponentes in domino tuo, . . . cogitas . . . nostra calamitate lactatum iri? . . . Si non valuisset integritas, . . . nonne valeret illa necessitas, communioque periculi . . . ? . . . Ista necessitas . . . efficit, ut quae contra nos de sociorum malivolentia tam multa connumeramus nihil sint nisi vana . . ." After a post-July 1402 insertion (p. 96, cited below in note 16), this context continues: "Quo mirari desinas si nostram praestare tunc videris societatem, quam rescindere contra naturam . . . fuisset . . ." *Invectiva*, ed. Moreni, pp. 90-97.

<sup>15</sup> Complaints presumably fitted into the text in 1402/03, since the whole section, pp. 130 (line 20)-135 (the reference to the event of 1397 is found on pp. 131 f.), is an insertion in one piece, and (p. 134) includes a statement on the Peace of Venice which cannot have been written before the summer of 1402 (see p. 106 below). For the suspicions in 1397 to which Salutati obviously alludes, see De Mesquita, *Giangaleazzo*, p. 230.

<sup>16</sup> *Invectiva*, p. 96 (reference to "maximam Bononiensium capitis diminu-

The results of such a juxtaposition of various portions are so odd that it seems strange no critical appraisal has ever pointed them out. Salutati may have chanced upon his path of patching without realizing the grotesque consequences, because he did not intend to produce a piece of original writing, but wanted only to refute Loschi's theses one by one. His plan, as it were, was to write a running commentary, which, after reproducing Loschi's assault *in extenso*, parried the adversary's argument chapter by chapter and sometimes paragraph by paragraph. When the later course of the war invalidated some of Salutati's original replies, or provided further support for points already made, appropriate references were added to keep the commentary up to date. This method of supplementation, which makes the book in some portions appear like a mosaic composed of pieces seen in perspective from different points, may have been largely responsible for its negligible literary success. But to the modern student it offers an opportunity to determine the periods, down to the very years and months, when Salutati wrote each passage.

From the examples discussed it is evident that a very considerable portion of the book originated as early as the winter of 1397-98. If a systematic attempt were made to break the text down into its chronological layers, it would appear that some of the expressions of a determined temper of resistance, apparently attributed by Novati to the situation of 1402, were phrased in the initial heat of the war. In that first draft we have undoubtedly to place all the passages in which Florence is envisaged as the leader and champion of universal resistance to the Milanese threat, such as the following: "Who does not see that this Florentine city is the defender of the common cause of liberty in Italy? Who would not admit that if the Florentine people were defeated, freedom could not survive, but all Italy would be in helpless serfdom?" And again: "While all others call us the champions

---

tionem, quae servitute contrahitur, et in quam intestinis seditionibus, quorumdamque, quibus patria venalis fuit, sceleribus inciderunt . . .") and 187 f. (Giangaleazzo "tandem . . . stultum et infelicem illum populum . . . iugo suae tyrannidis fecit miserabiliter occupari.")

and protagonists of Italy's salvation, do you think you may call us its enemies because we have resisted the tyranny of your Lord, who courts all Italy, and have opposed him more effectively than he expected?"<sup>17</sup>

One problem remains: how did it happen that Salutati, at a time when the original situation had long since changed, once more grew interested in his early draft, and that he felt its substance could go unaltered into the final version? Since, after the dissolution of the Visconti State following Giangaleazzo's death,

<sup>17</sup> "Quis non videt hunc nostrum populum tueri communem causam libertatis Italiae, qui non fateatur victo populo Florentino libertatem stare non posse, qui non agnoscat nobis servitute suactis totam Italiam sine remedio . . . servam fore?" — "An quoniam tyrannidi domini tui totam Italiam ambienti restitimus . . . atque potentius, quam cogitaret, obiecimus, salutis Italiae nos cognoscis, cum alii dicant athletas et pugiles, ab omnibus dissentiens inimicos?" *Invectiva*, pp. 88 f., 129.

The first of these passages is found in a section which, on close analysis, shows no signs of changes after 1397/98. To begin with, Salutati, in answer to a portion of Loschi's attack, copied pp. 79–83, on p. 83 f. defends the anti-tyrannical attitude of the Gauls (together with that of Florence) by saying "Gallorum . . . proprium est, regia libertate frui, tyrannos odisse . . .": a verdict pronounced obviously while the Florentine alliance with France still existed. The subsequent pages (84 f.) unmistakably reflect the mood of the time of the outbreak of the second (Mantuan) war, as is shown by the pledge that the Florentines will defend themselves and place their faith in God, and by the retrospective character of a reference to "prioris [that is, 1390–92] belli fortunam." Then, after grammatical objections to Loschi's use of the term "legio" for cavalry troops (pp. 85 f.), there follow: on p. 87, the boast of the reliability of the Florentine alliances, already proven in notes 6 and 9 to have been written at the beginning of the Mantuan war; on pp. 88–89, the passage with which we are here dealing, and, finally (after the quotation, pp. 89–90, of another section of Loschi's invective), the discussion, pp. 90–97, of Bologna as Florence's ally, shown in note 14 to have been part of the original draft except a brief reference to Bologna's defection in 1402 added toward the end (p. 96).

As to the second of our passages, quoted from p. 129, it will be sufficient to state, first, that the ten pages immediately preceding it (as far as they contain datable facts) are wholly devoted to defending the coöperation between the Guelphs and France and between Italians and "Gauls," — to a theme, that is, indicating 1397 or early 1398 as the time of origin; and, second, that the discussion following the passage (pp. 129 f.) describes as one of the existing alliances of Florence that with Francesco Gonzaga, which came to its end about the time of the Truce of Pavia in May 1398 (see note 9 above). In summation, indications are lacking in this section, too, of any later meddling with the text from the perspective of 1402.

the international situation was the very opposite of that of 1397, when superior Milanese armies had surrounded and devastated the Florentine territory, it is impossible that Salutati in 1403 could feel induced to repeat his former vows, never to flinch in the war. The "ardent desire for revenge," which Novati noted in Salutati's work, cannot have followed, and sprung from, the "joy felt in Florence over the sudden disappearance of the implacable enemy."<sup>18</sup> A number of the later insertions, to be sure, stem from the time of exultation after Giangaleazzo's death; but the same cannot be said of all of them. A part of the added sections clearly were written during the crisis of the summer of 1402, after Giangaleazzo's conquest of Bologna, when Florence was the only Italian state still to obstruct the course of Milanese expansion.

For instance, the fact that the "unhappy people" of Bologna have "pitifully" yielded themselves up to despotic servitude, is discussed with such fresh indignation and apprehension for the future that there can be no doubt these references were inserted at a time when the effects of Bologna's defection had not yet been annulled by Giangaleazzo's death.<sup>19</sup> And there are other paragraphs patently written before the end of the war, even though not parts of the original draft. For instance, we read: "We alone, indeed, are the barricade and obstacle which prevents that despotic regime, which has forced so many cities and towns . . . into wretched subjugation, from completing its work through

<sup>18</sup> See note 5 above.

<sup>19</sup> *Invectiva*, pp. 96-99, 187-188. After Giangaleazzo's death, the Milanese occupation troops were recalled from Bologna almost immediately; see De Mesquita, *Giangaleazzo*, p. 298.

Any suspicion that Salutati's laments over Bologna's treachery might refer to some earlier minor event, rather than to the conquest of June-July 1402, is ruled out by a chronological account added by Salutati to one of the paragraphs dealing with Bologna's plight. There he states that the recognition of the Tyrant's yoke by Bologna, and hence the disruption of her friendship with Florence, came about after the Florentine-Bolognese league had existed for "more than twenty-six years" ("plus quam viginti sex annis"; *Invectiva*, p. 96). Since that alliance had originated in March 1376 (see F.-T. Perrens, *Histoire de Florence*, V [Paris, 1880], p. 120), the passages in question were composed in the summer of 1402.

the whole of Italy. That was the sort of peace which your Lord desired. . . . To such a peace, however, I admit, the Florentines have always been adverse and a stumbling-block." <sup>20</sup> Although the tenor here is strikingly akin to that of some of the previously quoted passages of the 1397-98 draft, the phrase "we alone are the . . . obstacle which prevents that despotic regime . . . from completing its work through the whole of Italy" must have been written in the summer of 1402 when Milanese expansion had engulfed all northern and central Italy with the sole exception of Florence. Indeed, a complete reading of the section of the text in which these words occur shows that there is no reason to suspect that they belonged to the original draft. For this section is one in which every passage admitting of chronological identification points to conditions toward the end of the struggle. The claim "we alone, indeed, are the barricade and obstacle . . ." is the immediate continuation of one of the laments over Bologna's fall,<sup>21</sup> and the two passages together are flanked, on the one side by allusions to the Peace of Venice of 1400 and by a general verdict on Giangaleazzo's career in the *three* Milanese-Florentine wars,<sup>22</sup> and on the other by a concluding comment on the misery the insatiable conqueror left behind "after his death."<sup>23</sup> This means that the entire section is an insertion from the summer of 1402, with a few supplements added for publication after Giangaleazzo's death.

We may, therefore, state that the draft once jotted down in the first excitement of the war, was taken up for major revision before

<sup>20</sup> "Sed absit a nobis, ut dominum habeamus perdita libertate, pro qua maiores nostri nosque etiam tam longo tempore, tanto sanguine, totque laboribus, tot expensis, tanta cum gloria dimicavimus. . . . Video equidem quod si manus dederimus, cuncti cederent, et . . . sine sudore vel sanguine foedissimam subiret Italia servitutem. Nos obex, nos obstaculum soli sumus, ne cursum perficiat per omnem Italiam ille tyrannicus dominatus, qui tot urbes, tot castra, totque oppida miserrima conditione subegit. Hanc pacem dominus tuus optabat . . . Huius autem pacis . . . , fateor, Florentinos semper hostes et obstaculum extitisse." *Invectiva*, p. 189.

<sup>21</sup> *Invectiva*, pp. 187 ff.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 176-186.

<sup>23</sup> "Moriens," *ibid.*, pp. 189 f.

the delivery of Florence had occurred. Salutati resumed work when the challenge to Florence was at its height, under the impact of the heroic defiance shown by the Florentine leaders in the days of Bologna's fall. And, in fact, he was in closer contact than any other humanist with the deliberations and decisions then made in the city-councils. For it was he who penned the minutes of the decisive meeting which led to the resolve to resist to the end.<sup>24</sup> Thus Salutati's *Invectiva* began to take final shape at the moment when the meaning of the Florentine-Milanese struggle stood out most impressively — in a situation so similar in its perils and hopes to that of 1397 that passages expressing the tense sentiment at the outset of the war could once more sound meaningful for the day.

#### 4. A NEW CHRONOLOGY OF THE PAMPHLETS ACCOMPANYING THE FLORENTINE-MILANESE STRUGGLE

With the discovery that Salutati's *Invectiva* was composed in two successive phases, we have completed a chronological scheme which at last allows us to trace the interplay between the rise of the new politico-historical ideas and the political actuality.

So long as authenticity was ascribed to discussions in the *Paradoiso* alleged to have occurred before the Florentine-Milanese war had broken out; so long as Loschi was presumed to have published his pamphlet at some irrelevant moment in the course of the war, and Salutati as well as Rinuccini were thought to have written their rejoinders after the war was over — so long, indeed, did the facts seem to foreclose any high estimate of the political struggle as a factor, and there was no way of exploding the notion of a merely gradual unfolding of the Trecento ideas. Now, however, Loschi's attack, and Rinuccini's and Salutati's answers, are seen to reflect the moment when the hostilities had just broken out and when the issues at stake became first discernible. In the sup-

<sup>24</sup> The volume which includes the minutes is superscribed "Liber Consiliorum secretorum Comunis Florentie, tempore et manu mei Colucii etc." Compare the extracts published in *Commissioni di Rinaldo degli Albizzi* (see Chapter IX, section 2, note 8), vol. I, p. 11.



plements to Salutati's *Invectiva*, on the other hand, we can be sure to have before us a reflection of the final, dramatic climax of the struggle; and the apparently pioneering discussion of some of the new themes in the *Paradiso* can be dismissed as mere imitation, inserted decades afterwards, of the ideas of the Giangaleazzo period. With these changes, the unconvincing sequence of a story in which political reality and the growth of ideas fell hopelessly apart, is replaced by a picture of interaction and correlation.

Although these results do not yet provide a sufficient basis for a full synthesis of the period because they do not tell us where to place Leonardo Bruni's early humanistic works, a foothold has been gained from which we may freshly try to tackle even the moot problems of Bruni research.

But first we must consider the work of another Florentine author which in many respects rounds out the picture of the political literature provoked by the Florentine-Milanese struggle.

## CHAPTER III

### THE DATE OF GREGORIO DATI'S

#### *ISTORIA DI FIRENZE 1380-1406*

The history of the Florentine struggle against Giangaleazzo Visconti was first narrated and analyzed from a political historian's point of view by Gregorio Dati. This Florentine merchant and statesman had had an opportunity to observe the events and the decisions made in the crucial year 1402 from the vantage point of a leading position in one of Florence's great guilds. Important features of the Florentine political climate during the Giangaleazzo era would escape our notice if we did not have this retrospective synthesis for supplementing the notions formed from the pamphlets which accompanied the war. The pages of Dati's *Istoria* are filled with memories of the passion and anxiety felt in the fight for civic liberty and the very existence of the Florentine Republic. In a unique way we can observe in Dati's work a nascent understanding of the concatenation of all political developments on the Italian Peninsula, and of the need for a balance-of-power transcending the boundaries of single regions. In this invaluable source, then, we seem to find some of the colors with which to paint the picture of the Florence of Giangaleazzo's last years.<sup>1</sup>

But can we be sure that Dati put his reflections and memoirs on paper before there had been any essential changes in the Italian situation since the war, and before new experiences had

<sup>1</sup> The *Istoria* has thus been used in "A Struggle for Liberty," pp. 273 ff., 547, 555, and in *Crisis, passim*, esp. chapter 8, "Gregorio Dati's *Istoria* and the Beginnings of Quattrocento Historiography."

falsified the remembrance of the past struggle? That the *Istoria* was written less than ten years after Giangaleazzo's death — "about 1410" — was proposed by Dati's first modern editor, L. Pratesi.<sup>2</sup> But closer examination of Pratesi's arguments shows that none of them is really cogent or hits the vital points. Consequently, the role of Dati's *Istoria* as a quasi-contemporary account by an unusually well-equipped eyewitness has not been considered seriously enough by recent historians of the Renaissance. Since Dati did not die until 1435 — after a long political career in which he saw many things happen inside and outside Florence that were bound to affect deeply his appraisal of the past period of the wars with Giangaleazzo<sup>3</sup> — it is essential that we be assured of the early composition of his work.

Pratesi's dating of the *Istoria* was based chiefly on two arguments. One is that Dati "in the last part of his work" — that is in the ninth book of the *Istoria* which contains an important survey of the institutions and political offices of Florence — seemed to Pratesi to reveal the conditions of the city as they were "about 1410."<sup>4</sup> But the reader of Pratesi's edition notes with astonishment that the text offered by him will not bear out this contention. It is based on a manuscript made for a journalist-humanist of the sixteenth century, called Stradino. This version contains numerous adaptations to changes in the government and administration of Florence between 1410 and about 1500 — adaptations that actually go much beyond the short list, in Pratesi's introduction, of added references to specialized offices of the later Renaissance.<sup>5</sup> In the Stradino manuscript, we find vital institutions of the early Quattrocento Republic replaced by authorities created under and after the Medicean principate; for instance, in the place of the old city-state councils, the *Consiglio del Popolo* and the *Consiglio del Comune*, we find the *Consiglio degli Ottanta*

<sup>2</sup> L. Pratesi, in the introduction to his edition of Gregorio Dati, *L'Istoria di Firenze dal 1380 al 1405* (Norcia, 1904); see note 4 below.

<sup>3</sup> On Gregorio Dati's political career see *Crisis*, chapter 8, notes 4, 5.

<sup>4</sup> "Verso il 1410"; Pratesi, *op. cit.*, p. XIII n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Pp. XXX, XXXIII n. 1.

of Lorenzo's period, and the Savonarolian *Consiglio Grande*. Since Pratesi's edition ordinarily calls attention only to insertions made in Stradino's manuscript, but often does not reveal omissions and revisions, any attempt to determine the date of the work from the ninth book would have to be based on the older text published in an edition of 1735.<sup>6</sup>

But even this earlier version of the ninth book is far from proving an origin "about 1410." For although the *Consiglio del Popolo* and the *Consiglio del Comune* are listed in the ninth book, while no mention is made of two new creations of the year 1411, the Council of the "Two Hundred" (*Dugento*) and the Council of the "One Hundred Thirty-One," any conclusion that Book IX, in this version, antedated the year 1411 is refuted by other observations. For instance, one other event of the year 1411 is already known to this version; for the post of the "*Capitano di Cortona*" is listed,<sup>7</sup> and Cortona was not acquired by Florence until 1411. Other statements can hardly have been written during the early Quattrocento. One of these, a passage on the "*Governatori delle Gabelle delle Porti*," is explained with the words "today they are called [*oggi si chiamano*] *Maestri di Dogana*,"<sup>8</sup> an expression not used in Dati's time. Another passage concerns the "*Arte della Seta*,"<sup>9</sup> which is also a term not yet employed in Dati's day when the silk merchants were still included in the "*Arte di Por S. Maria*," as Dati himself states in his business memoirs as late as

<sup>6</sup> Compare the treatment of the city-councils in Pratesi's edition, p. 150, with the older version, tacitly suppressed by Pratesi, but published in *Istoria di Firenze di Goro Dati dall' anno MCCCCLXXX all' anno MCCCCV*, ed. G. Manni (Firenze, 1735), p. 139, and reprinted in G. Capponi's *Storia della Repubblica di Firenze*, vol. I (1875), p. 647; the entire portion from the ninth book which surveys the Florentine institutions and offices is reproduced by Capponi, pp. 643-654.

Since Pratesi's text, constructed as it is with the help of a late, adapted version, can nowhere be accepted without suspicion, the following notes will cite, or add to the citations, Manni's text in places where the divergence of the two editions affects the meaning, and the genuine reading is not obvious. A reliable edition of the *Istoria* is an urgent need.

<sup>7</sup> Ed. Manni, p. 143; ed. Capponi, p. 650.

<sup>8</sup> Ed. Manni, p. 140; ed. Capponi, p. 647.

<sup>9</sup> Ed. Manni, p. 134; ed. Capponi, p. 644.

posed, not "about 1410," but between 1402 and 1404, because Gabriello Maria's rule at Pisa came to its end in 1404. Furthermore, an examination of Dati's narrative technique shows that his usage of "now" with the present tense need not indicate contemporaneousness. This expression is simply a literary device by which Dati endeavors to transport himself and his readers into the time of the events; it is found repeatedly in the description of situations which long preceded the possible period of composition. For instance, Dati's account of the diplomacy of Florence in 1388, on the morrow of Giangaleazzo's conquest of Padua and Verona, begins: "*Now* the Commune of Florence launches forth upon great enterprises; now the Florentines are aware. . ." <sup>14</sup>

Under these circumstances, the date of the *Istoria* must be determined by an entirely different approach. Our first step should be a scrutiny of the general temper and political outlook of the work; not until this framework is established may passages be singled out for separate analysis.

There can be no doubt about the basic color that tinges Dati's narration of events and all his expectations for the future: Florence, after the dissolution of Giangaleazzo's state, is headed toward a height of economic well-being never before paralleled in her history; no cloud is to be seen on the sky in inter-Italian politics — with the Visconti empire destroyed, there is no powerful prince left in Italy to disturb her prosperity by conquest and expansion.<sup>15</sup>

This mood is tantamount to proof that Dati had not yet experienced, or at least did not as yet regard as cause for serious alarm, the expansion throughout Italy of the Kingdom of Naples

<sup>14</sup> "Ora comincia il Comune di Firenze a mettere le mani a' grandi fatti; ora sono chiari i Fiorentini. . ." Ed. Pratesi, p. 37; ed. Manni, p. 30.

<sup>15</sup> Compare the quotation in note 18 below, and Dati's comment on the Florentine decision not to intervene north of the Apennines after Giangaleazzo's death, the Florentines wished to allow the flames to burn out, "which, as they knew, would do their work even without Florentine efforts and expense, namely to succeed in the ultimate destruction of that dominion"; for they felt sure that the former subjects of the Visconti "would not wish the Duke or his sons ever again to be able to return to their former position. . ." (Ed. Pratesi, pp. 96, 97; ed. Manni, p. 90.)

under Ladislaus. This reached its climax when, during 1413 and 1414, Tuscany was engulfed in another dangerous struggle for city-state freedom against monarchical control of central Italy. As early as the spring of 1409, this new flood had reached Tuscany, when Cortona, southern outpost of the region, fell into Neapolitan hands—a threat answered within a few months by the conclusion of a defense league between Florence and Siena.<sup>16</sup> A reliable *terminus a quo* for work on the *Istoria* is provided by the conquest of Pisa and her incorporation into the Florentine region-state in 1406, an event repeatedly alluded to by Dati, and not yet very long past; for it is looked upon as the latest major change in the political situation to which Pisa will henceforth have to adapt herself.<sup>17</sup> Dati, therefore, must have worked out his narrative at some time between 1406 and 1413; one should suppose, before the disquieting events of 1409.

Within the framework thus established, examination of a few details will buttress the assurance and accuracy of our conclusions. In the first place, Dati's way of referring to the Pisa conquest as the apex of Florence's territorial and economic growth proves definitely that the incorporation of a much larger part of the Tuscan seacoast, including the excellent port of Leghorn, in 1421, was unknown to him when he phrased the text that has come down to us. This observation confirms the supposition that the narrative part of the *Istoria* did not undergo an adaptation to the author's experiences in the later phases of his life; we may assume the text to have remained what it was when first written. As to our findings that Dati was still unaware of the threat to Florence by the Neapolitan expansion, closer examination of Dati's appraisal of the effects of the Pisa conquest shows that the specific words he chooses can hardly have been used after the first efforts of Ladislaus to secure a foothold in Tuscany. As long as Giangaleazzo had been alive and Pisa independent, so Dati argues, Flor-

<sup>16</sup> See "Introduction," p. 7 above, and the analysis of the repercussion of Ladislaus' conquests since 1409 in *Crisis*, chapter 16, section "The 1410's: King Ladislaus of Naples in the Role of Giangaleazzo Visconti."

<sup>17</sup> See *Istoria*, ed. Pratesi, p. 106; ed. Manni, p. 100; also the quotation in the note which follows.

ence was in constant danger of being cut off from the sea and exposed to economic strangulation. After 1406, however, this danger had disappeared, and real estate values in the Florentine territory had accordingly been soaring, "now that he is dead and his people are undone for ever, . . . and the Florentines feel assured that they cannot be [again] involved in war."<sup>18</sup>

In passages of this kind we discover satisfactory criteria for determining the early date of Dati's work. When we consider the words just quoted in connection with the fact that, even as early as the spring of 1409, a well-informed citizen like Dati was hardly able to "feel assured that the Florentines cannot be [again] involved in war"; and when we further remember the observation, now gaining fresh significance, that Dati, in composing the sketch of the Florentine constitution in his ninth book, did not include the new city-councils created in 1411 — we need not hesitate to state that the politico-historical parts of the *Istoria* in all probability were written in 1407/08, whereas the annexed analysis of the Florentine constitution, if it did not originate at that same time, must have been added by the year 1410 at the latest.

<sup>18</sup> "Ora che egli è morto e disfatti in perpetuo i suoi e Pisa è de' Fiorentini, e' sono sicuri di non potere avere guerra. Ogni possessione è sicura e stimasi meglio il quarto, per lo quale miglioramento vengono a essere più ricchi che mai. . . . Priego Iddio che conceda loro sapersi temperare e reggere e regolare, . . . poi che a loro non può esser fatto guerra, che non la cerchino ad altri." Ed. Pratesi, p. 139, ed. Manni, p. 131.

## CHAPTER IV

### LEONARDO BRUNI'S

#### *LAUDATIO FLORENTINAE URBS*

##### 1. TWO VERSIONS OF THE *LAUDATIO*: A BLIND ALLEY

Our study of several Florentine works roughly contemporaneous with Leonardo Bruni's *Laudatio* has shown that whenever we place the challenge of the struggle against Giangaleazzo in the focus of our criticism, we obtain an *aqua fortis*, as it were, capable of dissolving errors about the background and the chronology of the literature of the period. Can we obtain a clearer view of the genesis and date of the *Laudatio* itself by applying to it the same kind of criticism? <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis* has never been published in extenso in its original text. Accessible in print are merely extracts published by Klette in an appendix to his edition of the *Dialogi* (see Chapter VI, section 1, note 3), pp. 84-105. A contemporary Volgare translation — *Le vere lode de la inclita et gloriosa città di Firenze, composte in latino da Leonardo Bruno e tradotte in volgare da frate Lazaro da Padova* — was published by F. P. Luiso in a nozze-print (for private circulation on the occasion of a marriage celebration) in Florence, 1899; but this reproduction is so rare that no copy may be available in American libraries; it could not be consulted in the preparation of the present book. Since a complete and reliable text of the *Laudatio* is indispensable, a critical text has been reconstructed from the following five manuscripts: G = Laur. Gadd. 90 inf. c. 13, containing much material of specific Florentine civic and political interest from the first two decades of the Quattrocento, written in the early part of the century, the *Laudatio* in a *bastarda* hand (Italian cursive of the late fourteenth-century type), with note at end "Liber mei Angeli Zenobii de Gaddis de Florentia XLVIII" (on Gaddi who copied himself some other manuscript in 1414, see Sabbadini, *Le Scoperte*, vol. I, p. 86 n. 8) — perhaps the oldest extant manuscript; L = Laur. 65 c. 15, of mid-Quattrocento Florentine origin (subscription "Iste Liber est Monasterii S. Salvatoris de



The chronology of the *Laudatio* — and of Bruni's *Dialogi* as well, as will be seen later — has long presented even greater puzzles than any of the problems posed by the *Paradiso* and the pamphlets of Loschi, Rinuccini, and Salutati.<sup>2</sup> In sifting the source

Septimo Cister. Ordinis et Florentinae dioec."), in spite of Bandini's assertion "parum correcte exaratus" (*Catalogus*, tom. II, col. 734) free of the frequent corruptions of all other mid-Quattrocento and late-Quattrocento manuscripts known to the author, distinguished by careful corrections by the scribe himself, showing none of the occasional mistakes and omissions of G, and hence probably a second copy close to the archetype; C = Vat. Chig. J. 215, second half of fifteenth century, related to G, but no derivation of it, with more frequent corruptions than G and L; O = Vat. Ottobon. Lat. 1901, second half of fifteenth century, related to L, but no derivation from it, also with more frequent corruptions; P = Vat. Palat. Lat. 1598, from Giannozzo Manetti's library. The text thus revised — as a rule following either G or L, according to the guidance given by the other manuscripts consulted — leaves no alternative readings of any consequence undecided, and provides a satisfactory basis for the critical discussion of all problems of content, structure, and chronology. As to the partial edition by Klette, which is said to have been based on L and collated with the manuscripts Laur. 52 c. 11 and Vindobon. Lat. 419, a comparison with the text of the listed five manuscripts shows that Klette frequently departs from L without giving any indication, presumably preferring the Viennese manuscript which proves to be an inferior text.

In all references to the *Laudatio*, throughout the present study, the text is given in accordance with the reconstruction made on the basis of the five manuscripts cited. The added letter L, and indication of the folios, refer to the manuscript Laur. 65 c. 15. Klette's extracts are also quoted with page reference whenever they include the part of the text under discussion.

<sup>2</sup> For the accepted chronology of the *Laudatio* and the *Dialogi*, see the "Chronologie von Brunis Schriften" in an appendix to this writer's edition of *Leonardo Bruni Aretino, Humanistisch-Philosophische Schriften*. Mit einer Chronologie seiner Werke und Briefe (Leipzig, 1928), pp. 159 f., henceforth cited as *Bruni, Schriften*. That list, intended to collect and integrate the datings which Bruni scholars had achieved by the 1910's, has still not been replaced. About ten corrections, or more precise datings, were published in 1932 by L. Bertalot in *Archivum Romanicum*, XV (1931), 298-301, but must be consulted together with this writer's rectifications in *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, XXII (1932), 368-371. Many new contributions to the chronology of Bruni's works are contained in *Crisis* (see its index under "Bruni").

For a critical edition of Bruni's correspondence, extensive preparatory studies were made two generations ago by F. P. Luiso, but his planned *Studi su l'Epistolario di L. Bruni* was never published even though it had been set up and printed in a few sets of proof sheets. The major results of Luiso's researches as far as the chronology of Bruni's letters is concerned

material for the background of Bruni's early writings, we immediately come face to face with the most startling contradictions. There is a set of sources which tells the story we should expect — that the *Laudatio* was written after the stirring experience of 1402; and, indeed, modern scholarship went through phases in which the composition of Bruni's panegyric was, in accordance with these sources, placed in or about 1403. But other testimonies exist which point to the year 1400; they do so in such an obvious manner that, among nineteenth-century scholars, the 1400 date was considered more probable by such critics as Alessandro Wesselofsky, Georg Voigt, and the majority of students. After many rounds of debate at the beginning of our own century, the date 1400 seemed finally to emerge as the stronger claimant.<sup>3</sup>

Let us begin by assuring ourselves that there are sources which definitely say that the *Laudatio* was a product of the time around 1403. There is, above all, an apparently conclusive statement in the text of the panegyric itself — a reference to the fact that the last among the conquests with which Giangaleazzo encircled

---

are included in a checklist of the "Chronologie der Briefe Brunis" found in another appendix of *Bruni, Schriften* (pp. 189-228). This makeshift list has remained the only tool available for the study of Bruni's letters whose text must still be consulted in the eighteenth-century edition, *Leonardi Bruni Arretini Epistolarum Libri VIII*, ed. L. Mehus, 2 vols. (Florence, 1741).

For more details on the state of the research on the chronology of Bruni's writings and letters see *Crisis*, chapter 10, note 4.

<sup>3</sup> The view that the *Laudatio* originated in 1405 had been held by L. Mehus in his introduction to the edition of Bruni's correspondence in 1741 (vol. I, p. LXI). G. Voigt, in the first edition of his *Wiederbelebung*, published in 1859 (p. 198), still followed Mehus without any fresh comment. But with Wesselofsky (in 1867) the second view came to prevail: ascription of the *Laudatio* to 1400. The *Laudatio*, Wesselofsky asserted, was composed "prior to the year 1401" ('prima dell' anno 1401'; Wesselofsky, II, 209 f.). This opinion was accepted by Voigt in the second edition of his *Wiederbelebung* in 1880 (vol. I, p. 312), and by M. Lehnerdt when revising the third edition of Voigt's work in 1893 (vol. I, p. 309). Th. Klette, in the introduction to his edition of the *Dialogi* in 1889 (quoted Chapter VI, section 1, note 3), p. 31, already regarded composition of the *Laudatio* before the *Dialogi* as a matter of course. The struggle between the two theories since 1900 will be the subject of the first two sections of the present Chapter.

Florence was that of Bologna.<sup>4</sup> As we know,<sup>5</sup> the occupation of Bologna by Milanese troops did not take place until the summer — exactly, June — 1402. Moreover, the context makes it quite certain that by the time of Bruni's writing the threat to Florence, which reached its climax with Bologna's fall, had passed. For Bruni begins his report on Florence's great deeds against Giangaleazzo by saying that "all Italy would have fallen into the power" of Giangaleazzo, had Florence "not withstood his might with her energy and wisdom."<sup>6</sup>

These indications in the text of the *Laudatio* are corroborated by some passages in Bruni's and Salutati's letters. It is exactly within the three or four years immediately after 1402 that the *Laudatio* is mentioned repeatedly. Now it is true that we have no comparable material for the time from 1400 to 1402 inclusive, since none of Bruni's letters prior to 1403/04 has been preserved. But even so, the repeated mention of the *Laudatio* in the years 1403/04, 1405, and 1406 appears significant. For from 1407 on we find no further reference to the work in Bruni's correspondence, except during the last part of his life when some extra-Florentine humanists belatedly attacked his youthful eulogy.<sup>7</sup> Most probably, therefore, the eager interest in the pamphlet between 1403/04 and 1406, coupled with its complete oblivion after those years, indicates that it was new at that time, and not a literary product familiar since 1400.

The first time the name of the *Laudatio* occurs in Bruni's letters is in *Epistola I* 8, written on September 5 of either 1403 or 1404. After a discussion of the methods to be followed in translating Plato's *Phaedon*, on which work was then in progress, Bruni turns to what obviously had been his preceding literary

<sup>4</sup> ". . . tandem etiam Bononiam occupat." *Laudatio*, L fol. 151r; omitted by Klette, p. 98.

<sup>5</sup> See above "Introduction," p. 6.

<sup>6</sup> See Chapter IV, section 2, note 17.

<sup>7</sup> In 1435-36, during the renewed Florentine-Milanese struggle in the time of Filippo Maria Visconti; criticism of the *Laudatio* then was raised by Pier Candido Decembrio and Lorenzo Valla. Bruni defended the work of his youth in his *Ep. VIII* 4 of 1440.

enterprise. He urges Niccolò Niccoli, to whom the letter is addressed, to show a manuscript of the *Laudatio* to Coluccio Salutati. "I have decided," he says, "to give to the oration in which I have assembled the glories of the Florentines the title of *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis*, and will you, please, take care that Coluccio [Salutati] sees it."<sup>8</sup> The implication is that the *Laudatio* was on the eve of publication when this letter was written.<sup>9</sup>

From a letter written a few years later we can reconstruct the testimony of one of Bruni's best-informed friends. Toward the end of 1406, when Florence had conquered and incorporated

<sup>8</sup> "Orationem, in qua laudes Florentinorum congeSSI, *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis* inscribi placet, eamque ut Colucius videat, curabis." *Ep. I 8*, ed. Mehus, I, 17.

<sup>9</sup> To be sure, there has been an attempt to transpose the date of *Ep. I 8* from 1403/04 to 1400. (See below pp. 83 ff.) But this is a proposition which is definitively refuted by what is said below in Chapter V (pp. 115 ff.)

The next mention of the *Laudatio* in Bruni's correspondence—not discussed above—shows that Niccoli had carried out the author's request, and that Salutati had become familiar with the work. In September 1405, during a melancholy period of illness spent in Viterbo, Bruni sent Salutati a letter in which he praised Florence, much as he had done in the *Laudatio*, as a place of abundance, cleanliness, and health, and above all as the seat of the new "*studia humanitatis*." He contrasted this roseate picture nostalgically with his present misery in small provincial Viterbo. To this the old teacher and friend answered irascibly on November 6, that, apparently, the less restraint Bruni had shown in his laments, the more emphatically had he proclaimed the glories of the "*patria*" Florence, "to whose praises you are so affectionately given that the copious and elegant oration which you have so ably written, not only for us but for posterity, has not sufficed to satisfy yourself; so that you feel impelled to start all over again, as though you had not said anything as yet, wherever an occasion presents itself." ("... quanto clarius in patrie laudes versabar; celebrationi cuius adeo affectus es, quod copiosa et ornatissima oratio, quam stilo luculentissimo non presentibus solum, sed posteris edidisti, te non potuisti satiare, quin etiam, ubicunque se dederit occasio, quasi nihil dixeris, velut ex integro idem propositum ordiaris.") Evidently, Salutati's irritation is caused by a reiteration within a brief span of time. If five years had elapsed since the composition of the *Laudatio*, Salutati's censure of Bruni's repetitiousness "wherever an occasion presents itself," would be somewhat surprising (Bruni's letter of September 13, 1405, to which Salutati replies, has been found by L. Bertalot in a manuscript volume of the Preussische Staatsbibliothek, Berlin, and published in *Archivum Romanicum*, XV (1931), 321-323. Salutati's answer is his *Ep. XIV 17*, Nov. 6, 1405, *Epistolario* vol. IV, pp. 113-120; the passage quoted is on pp. 118 f.)

Pisa and her vital harbors, Niccolò Niccoli suggested to Bruni that he should insert in the *Laudatio* a passage about this outstanding event. We do not know this suggestion *in extenso*, but Bruni says in his *Ep. II 4* of December 23 that Niccoli had proposed to him, "that I should add such a paragraph to the *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis* which I published recently, now that victory is won and Pisa has been brought to subjection."<sup>10</sup> Niccoli, consequently, must have been thinking that such a significant aftereffect of the struggle with Giangaleazzo as the incorporation of Pisa in the Florentine territorial state should not remain unnoticed in a work replete with pride of the Florentine deeds in that war. But why, then, did he fail to request inclusion of another and even greater event which had followed the resistance eulogized in the *Laudatio*: the triumph of Florence in the autumn of 1402? If we assume for a moment that the *Laudatio* had been written before the happenings of 1402, and that its recital of Florence's ordeal and championship of liberty against the Milanese tyrant applies to some earlier events in the war, how can we then explain that Niccoli advised Bruni to interpolate a passage about the Pisa victory, while the chief result of the great struggle, the dissolution of the Visconti State, went unnoticed? The fact that Niccoli considered it appropriate to insert in the *Laudatio* a reference to the Pisa conquest only, seems to imply that he identified the passages on the Florentine triumph and survival, "published recently" in the *Laudatio*, with the events of 1402.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> ". . . ut laudationi Florentinae Urbis, quam nuper edidi, nunc parta victoria Pisisque in ditionem adactis hanc partem adjungam." *Ep. II 4*, December 23, 1406, ed. Mehus, I, 36.

<sup>11</sup> The great probability of this inference deserves to be emphasized because F. P. Luiso as well as R. Sabbadini (Luiso, *Commento a Bruni* [see Chapter IV, section 2, note 1], p. 90; Sabbadini, *Storia e critica* [*ibid.*, note 2], p. 79) asserted that *Ep. II 4*, although it is the earliest dated letter of Bruni which mentions the *Laudatio*, does not contribute anything to the solution of the chronological problem. These scholars argued that the reference in *Ep. II 4* to the *Laudatio* as a work "quam nuper edidi" was without value on account of the want of precision in Bruni's use of the word *nuper*, which is sometimes applied to the passing of a few days and sometimes to a period of more than six years (as Luiso showed by a check of Bruni's usage). But *nuper*, in *Ep. II 4*, does not appear as an isolated

When these inferences from Bruni's correspondence are considered in combination with the evidence found in the *Laudatio* itself, there seems to be a case for the post-1402 origin of this work as complete and convincing as one could desire. And yet there is another side to the story. In the conversations in Bruni's *Dialogi ad Petrum Paulum Histrum*, at the beginning of the second day, the "oration in which I have assembled the glories of the Florentines" is summarized in detail, and the members of Salutati's circle are represented as praising Bruni's eulogy and calling it a patriotic deed for the glory of Florence.<sup>12</sup> That the *Dialogi* belong into the year 1401 has always been the general assumption in view of indisputable evidence found in its introduction and opening pages.<sup>13</sup> Consequently we find ourselves in a truly bewildering impasse: the same writing which mentions the occupation of Bologna by Giangaleazzo in June 1402, and after completion was shown to Salutati and Niccoli in the autumn of 1403 or 1404, is named, and even considered to be well known to Salutati, Niccoli and their circle, in Bruni's *Dialogi*, a work to all appearances written in 1401.

The only easy way out of this embarrassment would seem to be the assumption that the two groups of references to the *Laudatio* apply to two successive versions of the panegyric. One might argue that a first draft was already in existence at the time when the *Dialogi* were written, while the manuscript presented to Niccoli and Salutati about three years later contained the final version. In that case, all passages referring to events of 1402 could be explained as parts of the revision.

This was indeed the gist of the explanation offered in the first attempt of modern scholarship at a critical solution of the *Laudatio* puzzle. By this working hypothesis G. Kirner in 1889<sup>14</sup> tried to

word; it is found within a context which does permit conclusions about the meaning of the word in this specific case.

<sup>12</sup> Ed. Klette, pp. 67-71; ed. Garin, pp. 76-82. (On Klette's and Garin's editions see Chapter VI, section 1, note 3.)

<sup>13</sup> This evidence is discussed below in Chapter VI, section 4.

<sup>14</sup> In his pamphlet *Della 'Laudatio Urbis Florentinae' di Leonardo Bruni. Notizia*. (Leghorn, 1889).

overcome the initial crude split of opinion into two schools, the one relying on the fact that the completion of the *Laudatio* was simultaneous with *Ep. I 8*, the other believing in the testimony of the *Dialogi* to the neglect of the later sources.

Welcome as this deliverance from our dilemma would be, on closer examination it runs into unsurmountable obstacles. Some of the resulting difficulties were pointed out by F. P. Luiso as early as 1901.<sup>15</sup> And although Luiso did not exhaust all possibilities to refute Kirner's thesis, it soon was virtually abandoned. It is of paramount importance for the solution of the chronological puzzle of the *Laudatio* that we should know this abandonment to be final, and that there can be no return to a theory of successive versions when the elaborate edifice erected in its stead by Luiso also turns out to be built on quicksand. The following examination of the structure and background of the panegyric will try to demonstrate that this conclusion can hold its own against any reasonable doubt.

The first fact to be noted amounts to a clear warning against any hypothesis implying that the passages dealing with the Florentine triumph over Giangaleazzo might be later additions to the text. A counterpart to Bruni's glorification of Florence as the savior of liberty existed in the Greek work which served him as a literary model: the *Panathenaicus* of Aelius Aristides.<sup>16</sup> What the rescue of Greek liberty from suppression by the Persian king means for Aristides' panegyric, the rescue of liberty in Italy through Florence's struggle against the tyrant of Milan means for the *Laudatio*. And since the *Laudatio* by and large reproduces the categories of eulogy found in the Greek paradigm (though each item is elaborated with great independence of thought), it is unlikely that so fundamental a theme as the championship of liberty against foreign tyranny should not from the first have been part of Bruni's adaptation, and indeed one of the reasons for his choice of Aristides' panegyric as a model. So com-

<sup>15</sup> In his *Commento a Bruni*, pp. 90 f.

<sup>16</sup> For the relationship between Bruni and Aristides, see *Crisis*, chapter 9, section "Bruni's *Laudatio*: Originality and Literary Imitation."

elling in fact did this inference appear to Luiso that in it alone he saw a conclusive counterargument to Kirner's conjecture of subsequent interpolation.<sup>17</sup>

Now it is possible to check this conclusion by studying whether the train of thought of the *Laudatio* would here retain its coherence if the passages relating to the Florentine triumph over Giangaleazzo were removed.

Crucial in this respect is the section in the second half of the work which deals with the history of Florence in relation to other states: in Bruni's terminology the "*res foris gestae*." There the arrangement is that, after a eulogy of the "*virtutes Florentinae*" — the honesty, good faith, Roman-like greatness of mind of the Florentines in danger —, a few examples are given to illustrate "eminent military deeds."<sup>18</sup> These examples are only three, each of which represents a different category of Florentine achievements. First, the military virtue of the Florentine citizen-army is documented by its conquest, in 1254, of Volterra, a mountain town almost impregnable because of its location. Second, Florence's helpfulness to allied neighbors is demonstrated by the deliverance of Lucca from Pisa in 1252, thanks to the intervention of the Florentine army. Finally, the account turns to even "greater things": the aid Florence extended "not only to individual city-states, but to Italy as a whole,"<sup>19</sup> the most conspicuous kind of Florentine deeds. This paragraph is introduced by a special page on Florence's historic championship of liberty against tyrannical rule in Italy; the example given is the rescue of liberty in Italy by Florence's successful resistance against Giangaleazzo.<sup>20</sup> When we add that the description of the war with Giangaleazzo alone covers considerably more space

<sup>17</sup> Luiso, *Commento a Bruni*, p. 91.

<sup>18</sup> "... egregia rei militaris facinora." *Laudatio*, L fol. 149v; ed. Klette, p. 97.

<sup>19</sup> "Non enim privatim duntaxat huic vel illi urbi benefica fuit hec civitas, sed universe simul Italie." *Laudatio*, L fol. 150v, omitted by Klette on p. 98.

<sup>20</sup> *Laudatio*, L fol. 150v-152r; omitted by Klette, p. 98. The entire text is edited in *Crisis*, chapter 10, note 24.



than the accounts of the Volterra and Lucca episodes together, and therefore forms the very meat of the narrative, it is self-evident that this chapter could never have existed if it had not included from the beginning the victory over Giangaleazzo as its climax.

The only way in which an interpolation of the Giangaleazzo paragraph might still be suspected to have occurred would call for the conjecture that the entire section on the "*res foris gestae*" was added later. Such a hypothesis, however, is excluded by another observation. In Bruni's *Dialogi* we are given a kind of summary of the *Laudatio*, which allows us to form a rather neat idea of what the elements of the panegyric were at the time it was quoted in the *Dialogi*.<sup>21</sup> According to this testimony, the *Laudatio*, then as today, included these three major parts: the praise of the city and her scenic and architectural ornaments; the historical picture of the Roman origin of Florence together with the critique of Roman imperial Monarchy; and, finally, a section containing both the glorification of the "*res foris gestae*" and the assertion of a historical link between early Florentine Guelphism and Roman republicanism. Consequently, from the very first the *Laudatio* must have contained an account of the "*res foris gestae*" in its present place.

There are still two other references in the *Laudatio* to the events of the Giangaleazzo period. Though they are briefer and add little to the conclusions drawn from the major paragraph, it will be well to make sure that they do not place any obstacle in our way.

At first sight, one of the paragraphs in question might seem to give cause for suspicion. In the first section of the panegyric, in which the impress of Florence's beauty and scenic location on the beholder's mind is described admiringly, the author interrupts himself with the exclamation that the visible grandeur of the city leads those who look upon it toward understanding how it had come to pass that Florence succeeded "in fighting quite recently the most powerful and wealthy enemy with so much energy

<sup>21</sup> *Dialogi*, ed. Klette, pp. 67-69; ed. Garin, pp. 76-78.

that she caused everybody to be filled with admiration." After a brief praise of Florence for having stopped and overthrown the invader, the digression is concluded with the words that the right "time and opportunity to talk about the deeds of this city will come later" — which is, of course, a reference to the subsequent treatment among the "*res foris gestae*."<sup>22</sup> In this case, then, we are confronted with a digression from the normal course of the presentation. But this does not at all mean that the digression can be suspected of having been inserted. The idea of interrupting the flow of the argument at this specific point would not have occurred to anyone looking for an opportunity to incorporate in an older draft news of fresh military and political Florentine victories. The obvious place for insertions of that kind was the chapter on the "*res foris gestae*." If Bruni, in addition, deemed it desirable earlier in the text to call the reader's attention to the "quite recent" Florentine triumph, while referring to the later section for more extensive treatment, his motive cannot have been any embarrassment as to where to insert a supplement, but must have been the intention to achieve a special literary effect. Evidently, he wished the experience and glory of 1402 to determine the tone and the atmosphere of his pamphlet from the first.

The third and last paragraph which may have relevance to our problem is found in the introductory pages of the *Laudatio*, where the reader is given a preview of the topics to be dealt with in the work. In this synopsis we might possibly find traces of an originally different composition of the chapter on the "*res foris gestae*" if a difference ever existed. The delineation of the contents of that chapter announces that the greatness of Florence would become clear "from a view of her deeds both in our own age and in earlier periods."<sup>23</sup> This characterization can have been written only by one who had in mind the present arrangement of subject matter, including the praise of Florence's triumph in

<sup>22</sup> *Laudatio*, L fol. 137v-138r; omitted by Klette, p. 90. The entire text is edited in *Crisis*, chapter 10, note 25.

<sup>23</sup> "At si res gestas vel in nostra etate vel superiori tempore contempleris, nichil tanti videri potest ut illis anteponatur." *Laudatio*, L fol. 134r; ed. Klette, p. 85.

1402. For only the latter experience could explain why equal or even first place was accorded to the events of Bruni's own age.

Such are the arguments against the hypothesis of a revision of the *Laudatio* that can be gathered from its text. The result is the same when we turn our attention to the circumstances under which the work became familiar to Bruni's circle.

We must begin with a word of qualification. Since no incomplete manuscripts nor any other traces of successive versions of the *Laudatio* have ever come to light, the hypothetical assumption of two stages could in no case go beyond the theory that the presumed first draft remained unpublished and unknown to the reading public. The only permissible assumption is that an initial text, composed in 1400 and quoted by the author himself in his *Dialogi* one year later, was revised after the death of Gian-galeazzo, and was released for copying only then. This is in fact the hypothesis adopted by Kirner in 1889.<sup>24</sup> But it is precisely this one plausible form of the theory which will prove unsound when we learn how the *Laudatio* became known to its first readers.

Here, as elsewhere, we may start from the fact that the summary contained in the *Dialogi* provides an opportunity to reconstruct the content of the *Laudatio* at the time when it was quoted in the *Dialogi*. The conversation depicted in the second dialogue touches upon the historical concepts set forth in the *Laudatio*, especially Bruni's critique of Roman Imperial Monarchy, and his assumption of an historical affinity between Florentine Guelphism and Roman republicanism. These attainments of the *Laudatio* are praised by the participants of the *Dialogi* for their patriotic tenor and value to Florence, and Bruni is bold enough to make his friends affirm that "all citizens must be grateful to him" for these achievements.<sup>25</sup> Now, is it possible to believe that Bruni, who was not yet a Florentine citizen at that time, could have

<sup>24</sup> "Ma se l'edizione nella sua forma definitiva deve porsi verso la fine del 1405 o nel 1406, la *composizione* è certamente molto anteriore." (Italics mine.) Kirner, *Della Laudatio*, p. 6.

<sup>25</sup> "Pro qua quidem re omnes cives tibi habere gratias, Leonarde, debent . . ." *Dialogi*, ed. Klette, pp. 67 f.; ed. Garin, pp. 76 f. Compare above p. 75.

found in good taste, and would have dared to put before Florentine readers, this attestation of services rendered to his city of adoption, if the work of which he boasted so pretentiously was in fact nothing but a draft in manuscript for private use, still unknown to the public?

Furthermore, even if Salutati and Niccoli did not in 1401 have the knowledge of Bruni's panegyric that he ascribes to them in the *Dialogi*, one would expect them to have made themselves familiar with it afterwards, and certainly by 1403/04 when *Ep. I 8* was written. But a careful perusal of *Ep. I 8* indicates that the *Laudatio* was new to Niccoli as well as Salutati at the time of that letter. "I have decided," Bruni writes Niccoli (as already noted), "to give the oration in which I have assembled the glories of the Florentines the title of *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis*, and will you, please, take care that Coluccio [Salutati] sees it."<sup>20</sup> It would be preposterous to construe these words to mean that Niccoli was to turn over to Salutati the altered version of a work already known to the latter. Undoubtedly, Bruni would have expressed himself more specifically if he had wanted to say that Salutati should take cognizance of some insertions, in addition to the final title-form, of a familiar work.

True, Bruni's words do imply that Niccoli, unlike Salutati, knew the *Laudatio* when *Ep. I 8* was written. Niccoli even had a manuscript at hand, for otherwise he would not have been in a position to show it to Salutati. But this does not mean that Niccoli need have known and owned the *Laudatio* for any length of time. On the contrary, the situation presumed in Bruni's letter clearly precludes this possibility. Before leaving for a sojourn in the countryside at the "*villa Lazzanichi*," where the letter is dated, Bruni (so we may reconstruct the events) had given his manuscript of the *Laudatio*, or a copy of it, to Niccoli; and from the country he now instructed his friend by letter to add a title to the manuscript and then submit it to Salutati. Now if the manuscript had not been left to Niccoli recently, with the understanding that Bruni could dispose of it during his absence, how

<sup>20</sup> See note 8 above.

could he have thus curtly written, without any explanation of his request: in regard to Plato and the translation of the *Phaedon* "so much. As to the oration," etc., "will you, please, take care that Coluccio sees it." Obviously, then, the text which Niccoli was requested to forward was not his personal property, nor from his library; and given our knowledge of the intimacy of contact and regularity of exchange between Niccoli and Salutati regarding new literary events, we need not doubt that if Salutati read the *Laudatio* only at the time of *Ep. I 8*, Niccoli had not been acquainted with the work much earlier. Consequently, far from lending support to the hypothesis that a first draft of the *Laudatio* had preceded *Ep. I 8*, this letter suggests that the friends who are presented as participants in the *Dialogi* discussions had no knowledge of the *Laudatio* until about the time when *Ep. I 8* was written.

To sum up: examination of both the literary structure of the panegyric, and its summary in the *Dialogi*, assures us that the paragraphs dealing with the events of 1402 cannot be conjectured to have been inserted in an earlier and shorter draft; and what we know about the reception of the panegyric by Bruni's friends conflicts with the hypothesis of a first draft not circulated, or circulated privately before the publication of the work. In the face of these facts we must conclude that the theory of the growth of the *Laudatio* in two successive phases is so incredible in every part that its treacherous nature is evident, even though the paucity of our sources does not allow us to disprove directly the existence of a version which has been merely conjectured.

## 2. THE ALLEGED PRE-1402 ORIGIN OF THE *LAUDATIO*. A REFUTATION

With the elimination of the two-phase hypothesis, the riddle of the *Laudatio* grows into a chronological problem of even greater magnitude, involving the entire literary production of Bruni's youth. For as one and the same work cannot have been both quoted in the *Dialogi* in 1401 and written shortly before

the composition of *Ep. I 8* in 1403/04, there seems to remain only this alternative: Either there is some unknown element concealed behind the apparent origin in 1401 of the reference to the *Laudatio* in the *Dialogi*; or the September 5 on which *Ep. I 8* was written, in spite of so many seemingly convincing indications pointing to 1403/04, was that of a year preceding 1401.

On the surface, both assumptions seem to be entirely beyond belief. That the dedicatory letter to the *Dialogi* and the subsequent pages which set the stage for the conversations were written shortly after the Easter Sunday of 1401 is a fact as incontrovertible as any conclusion from literary evidence can be. The same is true of the post-1402 origin of *Ep. I 8* since the *Laudatio*, whose completion is presupposed in the letter, refers to the events of Giangaleazzo's last year.

Nevertheless, an escape from our embarrassment can ultimately be found only in one of the two directions. When all is said and done, one of these possibilities must hide the truth. Either the passages of the *Dialogi* which refer to the *Laudatio* were not written in 1401; or the references in the *Laudatio* that appear to point to events of 1402 do not in fact do so. In either case we must at some point decide upon a reinterpretation in contradiction to the meaning which the works in question seem to convey; or we must perform textual dissections reaching even deeper than that proposed for the *Laudatio* by Kirner.

The first scholar to cope with the chronological problem of the *Laudatio* in this more drastic fashion was F. P. Luiso.<sup>1</sup> The theory he proposed in 1901 has never been seriously challenged, and may still be looked upon as the accepted opinion.

The gist of Luiso's solution to the *Laudatio* puzzle is the hypothesis that the entire group of Bruni's works and letters which have a bearing on the date of the *Laudatio* can be ascribed to the period from 1400 to 1401. Stripped of some minor arguments, this

<sup>1</sup> In his study, *Commento a una lettera di L. Bruni e cronologia di alcune sue opere*, in *Raccolta di studii critici dedicata ad Alessandro D'Ancona* (Firenze, 1901), pp. 85-95. (In the present book quoted as *Commento a Bruni*).

thesis is built upon the following assertions: first, the passages of the *Laudatio* which seem to refer to the last year of Giangaleazzo and to the situation at the time of his death, refer in fact to events of the late 1390's; and second, along with the completion of the *Laudatio*, the composition of *Ep. I 8* and the beginnings of Bruni's *Phaedon* translation all fall into the year 1400.

Elaborated with considerable sagacity, Luiso's findings have seemed to close the old case of the *Laudatio*; R. Sabbadini, one of the most competent critics in the field, once called Luiso's chronology "*la data definitiva*."<sup>2</sup> But does the thesis stand the test in the light of an exact comparison of the *Laudatio* with what we have learnt about the Florentine political sentiment in the successive phases of the struggle with Giangaleazzo? Moreover, did Luiso in preparing his theory follow closely enough the master rule of historical criticism, to form a clear idea of a writer's intentions — even those unexpressed —, of his prejudices, and of the limits and the extent of the experience at his command?

The core of the proof which Luiso had to produce was the demonstration that the *Laudatio* was written by an author who knew the course of the struggle between Florence and the Visconti no further than to the first few months of the year 1400. For this purpose, Luiso singled out a number of political events vaguely mentioned in the panegyric, and endeavored to establish their identity with actual happenings in the Florentine-Milanese wars. It would be quite unfair, therefore, to contend that Luiso's analysis of the *Laudatio* was oblivious of the political background; on the contrary, Luiso was the first to pay serious attention to it. But he was satisfied with a piecemeal verification of some conspicuous references and omissions in the panegyric, without subjecting its outlook and convictions to a coherent inquiry. Only occasionally did he attempt to explore the author's political temper, or the perspective from which the past is seen and lined

<sup>2</sup> R. Sabbadini, *Storia e critica di testi latini* (Catania, 1914), p. 80. For the assent of G. Petraglione, editor of Pier Candido Decembrio's *Panegyricus*, the later Milanese reply to Bruni's *Laudatio* (see above Chapter IV, section 1, note 7), see *Archivio Storico Lombardo*, Ser. IV, vol. VIII (1907), 6.

up with the present: yet these are the very features that can reveal the circumstances under which the work was written.

Now it is true<sup>3</sup> that, in his efforts at identifying indeterminate allusions, Luiso did make one striking discovery: he found that Bruni's description of the war in many details may be considered to fit the crisis of 1401-02 less well than the late 1390's. For all the facts which form the climax of Bruni's narrative — grave defeats of Giangaleazzo, his offer of peace, his surrender of part of his conquests in northeastern Italy — correspond to occurrences in the period between the successful Florentine defense of Mantua in the year 1397 and the peace effected by Venetian intervention in March 1400. There is indeed, Luiso argued, only one single reference which would seem to compel identification with an event of 1402: Giangaleazzo's occupation of Bologna.<sup>4</sup> Now it is very strange, Luiso reasons, that only one occurrence of the year 1402 should be included in the pamphlet while even the ending of the war through Giangaleazzo's sudden death is not mentioned. One single reference which is out of the character of the context is suspect. Under the circumstances (still following Luiso's argument) one either might weigh the possibility that the four words "*tandem etiam Bononiam occuparat*" have been interpolated, or ask the question whether these words, instead of referring to the Milanese occupation of Bologna in 1402, represent a hyperbolical distortion of an earlier minor incident. In the eleventh book of his *History of the Florentine People*, Bruni was later to narrate that in 1399 there had been a good deal of suspicion and gossip in Florence to the effect that Bologna had formed secret connections with the Visconti. Could it not be that in the rhetorical language of the *Laudatio* this product of an agitated imagination was turned into a fact?<sup>5</sup>

There is, doubtless, something alluring in this line of reasoning.

<sup>3</sup> The following controversy against Luiso's theory, to the end of this section, is, with some abbreviations in the beginning, also found in *Crisis*, chapter 10, under the title "The Post-1402 Origin of the *Laudatio* and the Political Experience of the Giangaleazzo Period."

<sup>4</sup> See Chapter IV, section 1, note 4.

<sup>5</sup> This is the gist of Luiso's argument, *Commento a Bruni*, p. 92.



The observation that Bruni's references are focused on events prior to 1400, instead of on the situation at Giangaleazzo's death, calls to our attention an aspect of the *Laudatio* that needs explanation. And since a very striking trait of the pamphlet is thus disclosed, one easily understands why Luiso's conclusions have impressed many a student as a light shining at the exit of a labyrinthine maze. Nevertheless, the arbitrariness with which we are compelled to dispatch the Bologna incident should have sufficed to arouse distrust. An attempt to get rid of an embarrassing passage by declaring it an interpolation even though nothing has been found that would make a later change plausible, is the very opposite to sound historical procedure; and as for the alternative hypothesis, it is a far cry from listing certain rumors about a possible Bolognese disloyalty, to the outright statement that Bologna was "occupied" by Giangaleazzo.<sup>6</sup> This gap points to a weakness of the whole theory. To Luiso, the observation that nearly all the political and military events referred to in the *Laudatio* fall into the span of time ending with the peace of March 1400 appears sufficient proof of the author's ignorance of later political developments. But is it not possible that Bruni omitted certain happenings as less suitable for his purposes? This assumption would allow a simple explanation of the circumstance that we find a reference to only one incident of the year 1402. For the defection of Bologna to Giangaleazzo is an event which tends

<sup>6</sup> We are in a position to assure ourselves that Bruni did not overrate the long-range importance of the suspected Bolognese-Milanese rapprochement of 1399. Shortly before he wrote the note in his *Historiae* (ed. Santini [see Chapter IV, section 3, note 7], p. 276) to which Luiso referred, he jotted down in his memoirs a concise appraisal of the political developments during his youth. There the "acceptance of the Milanese yoke" by Bologna in June 1402, together with the preceding military defeat of Florence at Casalechio in the Bolognese territory, is regarded as a crucial blow precipitating the crisis of the war, which was all the more devastating for being a reversal of all previous conditions, because Bologna, as Bruni puts it, "up to that day had been allied with the Florentine people." ("... ad eam diem in societate florentini populi fuerat." *Rerum Suo Tempore Gestarum Commentarius*, ed. C. Di Pierro in "Rerum Italicarum Scriptores," Nuova Ed., XIX, Parte III [Bologna, 1925], pp. 432, 433).

to increase admiration for Florence's triumph, by accentuating the impression of her lone perseverance in the war.

Bruni himself in later years admitted the subjective nature of the selection and presentation of facts in the *Laudatio*. In defending his work against criticism, he distinguished the literary *genre* of "panegyric," which he had followed, from "historiography," which is pledged to objectivity.<sup>7</sup> The former, he said, was to inspire the reader by effective oratory, even at the expense of exactitude in details.<sup>8</sup> Now the account in the *Laudatio* of the political and military vicissitudes preceding the peace of March 1400 is a genuine model of what arbitrary rhetorical emphasis can achieve while still avoiding outright falsification. By narrating first the recognition of the Visconti as Lord of Pisa, Lucca, Perugia, and Assisi — all happenings of the years 1399 and 1400 — and only afterwards the Florentine military successes in the defense of Mantua in 1397–98, Bruni succeeds in engendering the historically misleading impression that the Florentine resistance led in the end to a victory on the field of battle and the frightened retreat of the tyrant into his capital. It is thanks to this skillful disguise of the true sequence of events that Bruni, in the excursus on the Giangaleazzo war contained in the chapter on Florence's scenic beauty, can tell his readers that the city eventually "not only repulsed the invader and checked the course of his victories, but even overthrew him after a long war."<sup>9</sup>

Once this stratagem of the *Laudatio* is discerned, there remains no difficulty in understanding that Bruni could not without

<sup>7</sup> Bruni, *Ep. VIII 4*. Bruni, an admirer of Polybius, had undoubtedly taken his inspiration from Polybius X 21.8, where a quite similar distinction is made between *ἐγκώμιον* (encomium), which requires selection of facts and glorification of deeds, and *ιστορία* (history), which demands sincerity and proof. See F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie* (Leipzig, 1901), p. 227.

<sup>8</sup> Luiso was obviously aware of this character of Bruni's eulogy, for he referred to it when observing some chronological irregularities in the narrative. (*Commento a Bruni*, p. 92). But he did not recognize the practical implications of Bruni's procedure.

<sup>9</sup> See the edition of this entire paragraph of the *Laudatio* in *Crisis*, chapter 10, note 25; and the quotation in note 18 below.

detriment to his plan wind up his historical survey with Giangaleazzo's sudden death. The whole rhetorical scheme of the tyrant's defeat and enforced suit for peace would have been destroyed. It is, in fact, difficult to see what Bruni could have done, in order to attain his ends, about the two decisive events of 1402 — the fall of Bologna and the death of the enemy — except what we actually find in his work. On the one hand, the account of Giangaleazzo's recognition as Lord of Bologna had to be appended to the narrative of the extension of his rule to Pisa, Lucca, Perugia, and Assisi in 1399-1400; in this way the fall of Bologna in 1402 lost the appearance of being a catastrophe for Florence, which it actually was. On the other hand, nothing definite was to be said about the reasons for the subsequent collapse of Giangaleazzo's State and the survival of the Florentine Republic; the reader was to forget that the eventual triumph of Florence was due not only to the *virtus* of the Florentines, but also to the whim of *fortuna*.<sup>10</sup>

After discovering this underlying structure of the panegyric, we understand that Bruni's neglect of the final war events does not necessarily prove his ignorance of them nor, consequently, the composition of his work at an early date. So much at least we may state with confidence: an intentional omission of the neglected facts is equally possible.<sup>11</sup> The ultimate criterion in judging Bruni's knowledge or ignorance of contemporary events cannot be found in the information which he himself wished to impress on his readers. It must be sought in such of his statements as show him off guard; in passages which convey his general estimate of past, present, and future, and consequently disclose his experiences, fears, and hopes.

Here we must recall the changes in the climate of political

<sup>10</sup> See the edition of this entire paragraph of the *Laudatio* in *Crisis*, chapter 10, note 24.

<sup>11</sup> The soundness of this conjecture is supported by the observation that Salutati in his *Invectiva* avails himself of precisely the method which we are attributing to Bruni. This fact is proved later in this chapter, in the section "Salutati's *Invectiva* as a Source of Bruni's *Laudatio*;" see esp. notes 5-7.

opinion during the span of time in which the *Laudatio* must have been composed.<sup>12</sup> There was a world of difference between the political constellation after the peace forced upon Florence by Venetian arbitration in March 1400, and that after Giangaleazzo's death. In the spring of 1400 the concessions made by the Duke of Milan in northern Italy were compensated by his gaining a free hand south of the Apennines. With regard to Florence, nothing was agreed but a mutual surrender of the conquests made by either party during the past war—a settlement which left Giangaleazzo in undisputed possession of the central Italian empire with which he had surrounded Florence in a gradually tightening stranglehold. The immediate Florentine reaction to this *pax Venetiana* was a feeling of utter dismay, a general outcry that the peace treaty, so far as Tuscany was concerned, did not put an end to the struggle but merely improved the Visconti's chances to prepare for his decisive attack. "A peace dictated by the adversary of Florence," a treaty "which may rather mean [fresh] war" and an evasion of the real problems—thus the settlement was described in official Florentine documents.<sup>13</sup> To find an escape from this predicament, Florence, from the autumn of 1400 to the autumn of 1401, made her desperate attempt to encircle Milan through an alliance with King Rupert of Germany—a union which, as has been pointed out, was an embarrassing incident in the long history of Guelph anti-imperial traditions, a break with the Florentine past.<sup>14</sup>

With these conditions one must compare the state of Italian affairs in the autumn of 1402, the end of a challenging and critical year in which Florence, abandoned by all her allies, had fought on alone until she finally remained as the triumphant survivor. It was then that Tuscany became free of Milanese troops for the first time in more than a decade; the Florentines,

<sup>12</sup> See above, "Introduction," p. 6, and the analysis of the political development from 1398 to 1402 in "A Struggle for Liberty," pp. 279 ff., 285 f.

<sup>13</sup> Compare the description of this reaction in De Mesquita, *Giangaleazzo*, pp. 255-258.

<sup>14</sup> See "Introduction," p. 6, and the appraisal of this episode in "A Struggle for Liberty," pp. 281 f.

as we learn from Gregorio Dati and others among his contemporaries,<sup>15</sup> were so firmly convinced of the finality of the Viscontean collapse that they once more left northern Italy to itself, as they had done before the rise of Giangaleazzo's empire. Not until fifteen or twenty years later, when Giangaleazzo's son, Filippo Maria, again raised the Visconti power to nearly its former extent, did Florence realize that her feeling of permanent security and triumph over "tyranny" had been a blunder.

By the comparison of these two phases of the international situation we can see clearly in what respect a Florentine author writing in 1400 was bound to differ from one writing in 1403 or later. The despairing mood of the Florentines in the summer of 1400 was exactly the opposite of their later confidence that the drive of the Visconti toward one large monarchy in northern and central Italy had been permanently foiled; in that summer, the Florentine citizenry was far from being filled with pride at having triumphantly withstood an ultimate trial. At the end of 1402, on the other hand, when the Florentines looked back upon their stubborn resistance, it could readily appear as a victorious fight of the Florentine Republic not only for herself but for the deliverance of Italy from the yoke of the tyrant.

In the light of these changes in the political climate let us now read the final estimate with which the *Laudatio* concludes the account of the Giangaleazzo wars. "With such a mind this commonwealth was endowed, with such a measure of *virtus* did she meet in strife the most powerful and resourceful enemy, that she compelled him who shortly before had menaced all Italy and believed that nobody could withstand him, to wish for peace, to tremble within the walls of Milan, and in the end not only to abandon the cities of Tuscany and the Flaminia, but even to lose the largest part of northern Italy. . . . What greater thing could this commonwealth accomplish, or in what better way prove that the *virtus* of her forebears was still alive, than by her own efforts and resources to liberate the whole of Italy from the threat of

<sup>15</sup> See "A Struggle for Liberty," pp. 546 ff., 554 f.

servitude? In consequence of which feat she receives congratulations, praises, and thanks from all nations every day." <sup>10</sup>

Against the background of the preceding political analysis, this statement conveys unquestionable allusions to post-1400 events. We may concede that the phrase, that Giangaleazzo lost "the largest part of northern Italy" (*Galliae maximam partem*), is too indefinite to indicate with certainty whether the dissolution of the Visconti State after 1402, or only Milan's surrender of Paduan and Mantuan territories in 1400, was in the author's mind; though one may hazard the opinion that even a writer intent on rhetorical effects would hardly have called "*Galliae maximam partem*" that fraction of northern Italy around Padua and Mantua which Giangaleazzo had returned. There is no doubt, however, about what Brunì had in mind when he stated that Giangaleazzo was compelled "in the end to abandon the cities of Tuscany and the Flaminia." For this phrase is not merely in contradiction to the state of affairs in March 1400 — at that time it could not even be imagined as a rhetorical overstatement. Else we should have to assume that a Florentine author dared to boast of the abandonment of the "cities of Tuscany" by the Milanese troops at the very moment when the streets of Florence were echoing with indignation at the "treachery" of Venice in stipulating the Milanese evacuation of northeastern Italy while allowing the occupation of the "cities of Tuscany" to continue unimpeded. With this explicit phrase, we may definitely say, Brunì can have alluded only to the happenings after Giangaleazzo's death.

And what about the designation of Giangaleazzo as the powerful and resourceful enemy "who shortly before menaced all

<sup>10</sup> "Sic igitur hec civitas animata cum potentissimo et opulentissimo hoste ita summa virtute congressa est, ut, qui paulo ante toti Italie imminabat nec quenquam sibi resistere posse arbitrabatur, eum et pacem optare et intra Ticinì menia trepidare coegerit, et tandem non solum Etruriæ ac Flaminie urbes relinquere sed etiam Gallie maximam partem amittere. . . . Nam quid potuit maius, quid preclarius hec civitas edere, aut in qua magis re maiorum suorum virtutem in se conservatam ostendere, quam universa Italia suo labore suisque facultatibus a servitutis periculo liberata? Ex quo quotidie ab omnibus quidem populis gratulationes, laudes, gratie huic urbi acte. . . . *Laudatio*, L fol. 151v-152r; omitted by Klette, p. 98.

Italy," and Bruni's assertion that Florence "by her own efforts and resources liberated the whole of Italy from the threat of servitude?" These sentences imply that such a threat no longer existed by the time the paragraph was written. Moreover, we need not be afraid that these expressions may be among those rhetorical hyperboles which are not to be taken at face value. For the same sentiment of a happy and glorious escape from a past crisis appears as the keynote wherever the *Laudatio* touches upon the war with Giangaleazzo.

In the chapter on Florence's military exploits (the "*res foris gestae*"), the section whose concluding passages we have just been interpreting had opened the praise of the Florentine deeds in the war with Giangaleazzo with the question: could anyone deny that "all Italy would have fallen into the power of the Ligurian enemy [meaning Giangaleazzo as lord of the western part of northern Italy], had not this one commonwealth withstood his might with her energy and wisdom? For who in all Italy was then comparable to that enemy in power and relentless energy? Or who would have endured to the end the onset of a foe whose very name brought terror to every mortal man?"<sup>17</sup> The Milanese Duke, Bruni goes on to say, could have been a happy and eminently able prince, had he repressed his vicious desire to sow discord among the states of Italy in order to rule over the divided. But Florence remained mindful of her traditional mission to preserve the freedom of Italy; she resisted, and saved all.

It is exactly from the same retrospective point of view that the Milanese struggle is seen in the first part of the *Laudatio*, in the chapter on Florence's scenic beauty. "This Duke," Bruni there says, "a prince who, on account of his resources and power, was a source of fear to transalpine nations as well as to all Italy, puffed

<sup>17</sup> "An quisquam tam absurdus ingenio aut tam a vero devius reperiri poterit qui non fateatur, universam Italiam in potestatem Ligustini hostis perventuram fuisse nisi hec una urbs suis viribus suoque consilio contra illius potentiam restitisset? Quis enim erat in tota Italia qui aut potentia aut industria cum illo hoste comparari potuisset? Aut quis eius conatum pertulisset, cuius nomen ipsum cunctis mortalibus erat terrori?" *Laudatio*, L fol. 150v-151r; omitted by Klette, p. 98.

up in his hopes, vainglorious in victory, racing along like a tempest, occupying everything with amazing success, found himself confronted with this one commonwealth, which did not only repulse the invader and check the course of his victories, but even overthrew him after a long war, . . . a war the magnitude and length of which was admired by all people, so that everybody was wondering whence such immense energies, resources, and monies needed for the war had become available to one single city."<sup>18</sup>

Though it is literally correct to say with Luiso that in all these passages there are no references to specific events of the years 1401 and 1402, we must be on our guard lest by clinging to apparent tangible "facts" we forfeit the spirit for the letter. Fitting the *Laudatio* in its historical place, we may state with confidence that none of the paragraphs which we have analyzed could have been phrased before the threat of Giangaleazzo's empire had ceased to exist and Florence again felt secure in her final victory. Indeed, there could be no more genuine testimony to Florence's proud and lonely stand in 1402 than the quoted passages of Bruni's panegyric.

### Excursus

#### A RECENT ABORTIVE APPROACH TO THE PROBLEMS OF THE *LAUDATIO*

Luiso's ascription of the *Laudatio* to the year 1400<sup>1</sup> might not have remained unopposed for almost half a century, had not the most competent critic in the field, R. Sabbadini, endorsed Luiso in a widely used standard work, his *Storia e Critica di Testi Latini*, published in 1914.<sup>2</sup> Especially for this reason, it would seem, the chronological problems

<sup>18</sup> "Eum enim ducem, cuius opes atque potentiam et transalpine gentes et reliqua omnis formidabat Italia, spe elatum, victoriis exultantem omniaque miro successu quasi tempestatem quandam occupantem hec una civitas inventa (reperta *L.*, om. *O*) est que non solum invadentem reprimeret cursumque victoriarum retardaret, verum etiam post longum bellum affligeret. . . . Dico igitur omnes homines sic esse admiratos magnitudinem contentionis et diurnitatem belli ut secum ipsi obstupescerent unde huic uni civitati tante vires, . . . tante ad bellum suppedirent pecunie." *Laudatio*, *L* fol. 137v; omitted by Klette, p. 90.

<sup>1</sup> P. 83 f. above.

<sup>2</sup> See Chapter IV, section 2, note 2.



posed by Bruni's earliest works have not again been systematically attacked.

It would appear, however, that Sabbadini in his later years became himself aware of fallacies in his and Luiso's theory. In 1930, in an article published in the *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*,<sup>3</sup> commenting on E. De Franco's *I Dialoghi al Vergerio di Leonardo Bruni* (Catania, 1929), he returned to the problems of the *Laudatio* and the *Dialogi* in a fashion which indicated that by then he was reconsidering his position. What he now had to say was so vague, however, that the new suggestions he made were practically of no help at all, and some of his observations were so obviously mistaken that they would be apt to confuse the issue if they were taken seriously and used in a reconsideration of his and Luiso's earlier views. It is not surprising that this article of 1930 has not evoked any noticeable echo among Renaissance scholars. As a consequence, we have thought it preferable not to complicate our criticism of the Luiso-Sabbadini theory by references to Sabbadini's afterthoughts. The following comment will make it possible to judge them on their own merit, while stressing the symptomatic fact that Sabbadini in his later years felt doubts about his former position, without being able to resolve them satisfactorily.

The change of Sabbadini's opinion by 1930 transpires from the following statement: "It is true," he then said, "that the dialogues are thought to have been preceded by the 'Laudes florentinae urbis' which Bruni wants us to believe he has already completed and even given to Roberto Rossi to read; but this is not the only one among the numerous pretenses of the book [that is, of Bruni's *Dialogi*]; the 'Laudes' were published a couple of years later with the somewhat modified title of 'Laudatio.'"<sup>4</sup>

Accordingly, it is not easy to recognize what precisely Sabbadini's final opinion may have been. Since he said nowhere that he had come to look upon Luiso's once applauded dating of the *Laudatio* in 1400 as an error, it would be strange if he had returned to Kirner's assumption of two successive versions of which only the second was published. The alternative is that in the end he adhered to something like the hypothesis that the preserved text of the *Laudatio* stems from the year 1400, in conformity with Luiso's assumption, but, according

<sup>3</sup> Vol. XCVI, pp. 129-133.

<sup>4</sup> "Vero è che i dialoghi sarebbero stati preceduti dalle 'Laudes florentinae urbis', che il Bruni vuol far credere d'aver già compiute e date anzi a leggere a Roberto Rossi; ma questa non è la sola fra le non poche finzioni del libro: le 'Laudes' uscirono un paio d'anni più tardi col titolo alquanto modificato di 'Laudatio.'" Sabbadini, *Giornale Storico*, XCVI, 130.

to Kirner's proposition, was not made known to anybody until about 1403 when the title "*Laudatio*" was coined; in that case Roberto de' Rossi's alleged knowledge of the work in 1401 would be a literary "pretense."

If this kind of superficial compromise between Luiso's and Kirner's assumptions was really Sabbadini's last guess, it could not claim a place among the attempts to solve the chronological puzzle of Bruni's early writings. For if the work to which Bruni referred in 1401 was not different from the one we have today, we are compelled to infer with Luiso that the passages on Florence's triumph over Giangaleazzo do not refer to 1402, but to events around 1399; that is, the criticism previously directed against Luiso's thesis retains its force whether we assume that the *Laudatio* was published, or only written but not published, in 1400. Again, if the *Laudatio* was not yet known to Bruni's friends when, in the *Dialogi*, he publicly prided himself on being the author of the panegyric, then also the set of arguments applies by which we refuted Kirner's assumption of Bruni's boasting of an unpublished work. In other words, a compromise between Luiso's and Kirner's theories merely creates a halfway position which is open to the criticism leveled against either theory.

It should also be noted in this context that one particular assertion in Sabbadini's statement is not at all exact; when it is corrected, we see even more clearly the propriety of the criticism just pointed out. Contrary to Sabbadini's assertion, Bruni in the *Dialogi* does not "want us to believe that he has already . . . given Roberto Rossi [the *Laudatio*] to read"; it is Salutati (not Rossi) who mentions the *Laudatio* as a book known to him.<sup>5</sup> After Salutati, it is Pietro di ser Mino who declares that he has read Bruni's eulogy and proves it by analyzing and evaluating the contents of the pamphlet which in its outline, according to his survey, was the same then as we know it today. From Salutati's answer to Pietro di ser Mino, the reader must conclude that Salutati, too, was thoroughly familiar with all the relevant details of the eulogy. The idea that Bruni would have portrayed his friends as praising and discussing in detail a book unknown to everyone else remains, therefore, as absurd as was pointed out.<sup>6</sup>

There is, however, one argument among Sabbadini's new suggestions which requires closer attention. He makes the point that, while the reference in the *Dialogi* is made to Bruni's "oration in which he [Bruni] has most carefully assembled the glories of the city of Florence" (*oratio illa, in qua laudes Florentinae urbis accuratissime*

<sup>5</sup> *Dialogi*, ed. Klette, p. 67, ed. Garin, p. 76.

<sup>6</sup> See above pp. 80 f.

congressit), Bruni in his *Ep. I 8* says: "I have decided to give to the oration in which I have assembled the glories of the Florentines the title of *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis*" (*orationem, in qua laudes Florentinorum congressi, Laudatio Florentinae Urbis inscribi placet*). From this Sabbadini draws the inference that, whereas Bruni's work at the time of the composition of the *Dialogi* was still called the "*Oratio in qua laudes Florentinae urbis congressit*," these words were being changed to, or replaced by, the definite title "*Laudatio Florentinae Urbis*" at the time of *Ep. I 8*. If this, indeed tempting, conclusion were correct, it would amount to proof that *Ep. I 8* succeeded the *Dialogi*, and thus provide an unexpected corroboration to the critique of Luiso's chronology at which we have arrived by much more complicated considerations.

Unfortunately, the inference is not borne out by a comparison of the available references to Bruni's eulogy. For even after *Ep. I 8*, Bruni and his friends continued to refer to the eulogy as the oration dealing with the "*laudes Florentinae*" whenever the work was to be mentioned in a Latin text in which the use of a verbal form of the title, or a prepositional construction, fitted more smoothly than an abstract noun like "*Laudatio*." In a letter from Salutati to Bruni in 1405, mention is made of the "*copiosa et ornatissima oratio*" composed by Bruni "*in patrie laudes*."<sup>7</sup> In the *Laudatio Leonardi historici et oratoris*, written by an anonymous author shortly after Bruni's death, we read: "*De laudibus Florentinae Urbis orationem composui*,"<sup>8</sup> and similarly in Poggio's *Oratio Funebris*: "*De laudibus huius florentissimae urbis edidit librum unum*." The title used by Manetti both in his funeral speech on Bruni and in his later *Adversus Judaeos et Gentes* is "*De Laudibus Florentinae Urbis*."<sup>9</sup> This, or "*De Laudibus Florentinae*," is also the title in the early Gaddi manuscript, and in the four manuscripts from the time about or after Bruni's death, used in our reconstruction of the text of the *Laudatio*.<sup>10</sup> Finally, in 1440 Bruni

<sup>7</sup> Salutati, *Ep. XIV 17, Epistolario* vol. IV, pp. 118 f.

<sup>8</sup> Ed. E. Santini in his *Leonardo Bruno Aretino e i suoi "Historiarum Florentini Populi Libri XII"* (reprinted from *Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, XXII, 1910), p. 152.

<sup>9</sup> Manetti, *Oratio Funebris in Leonardi Laureatione*, in Bruni's *Epistolae*, ed. Mehus, vol. I, p. CII; *Adversus Judaeos et Gentes*, cod. Vat. Urbin. Lat. 154, fol. 120v. On *Adversus Judaeos* and its date, see *Crisis*, chapter 14, note 55.

<sup>10</sup> G "*Laudes Florentine Urbis*"; L "*Oratio De Laudibus Florentine Urbis*"; O "*Oratio De Laudibus Florentine Urbis*"; C "*Oratio De Laudibus Florentie*"; P "*De Laudibus Florentine Urbis*." (See Chapter IV, section 1, note 1, for these manuscripts.)

himself talked in his *Ep. VIII 4* of "*illa quae in laudem Florentinae urbis scripseram*."<sup>11</sup>

Consequently, if we thought it justified to deduce from the *Dialogi* passage, "*oratio illa, in qua [Bruni] laudes Florentinae Urbis conges- sit*," that the *Dialogi* preceded *Ep. I 8* where the title *Laudatio* is used, all the quoted references to the "*laudes Florentinae urbis*" from Bruni's later years and the time after his death would also have to be judged as preceding *Ep. I 8*.<sup>12</sup> The assertion, on the other hand, that the *Dialogi* are still entirely unfamiliar with the term "*Laudatio*" is shown by closer inspection to be in error. For while it is true that Salutati in the *Dialogi* is made to refer to "*oratio illa, in qua [Bruni] laudes Florentinae urbis conges- sit*,"<sup>13</sup> Pietro di ser Mino's appraisal of Bruni's eulogy begins: "*Cum istam laudationem legerem* . . ."<sup>14</sup>

Since even this at first so promising path leads on treacherous ground, the brief return of Sabbadini to the problems of the *Laudatio* and the *Dialogi* in 1930 is best ignored entirely in the discussion of Bruni's early literary works.<sup>15</sup>

### 3. THE DATE OF THE LAUDATIO: SUMMER 1403 OR SUMMER 1404

Two facts for the date of the *Laudatio* have been established by our study of Bruni's letters and of the relationship of the panegyric to its political background: the *Laudatio* was written after the experience of 1402 and was completed shortly before September 5 of a year as yet not finally determined, but closely following the terminal crisis of the Florentine-Milanese struggle. These findings also furnish the key for the chronology of the second famous work of Bruni's youth, his *Dialogi* — last and decisive link in a reappraisal of the literature of the period against its political background. But before turning to the *Dialogi*, we must still more accurately define and integrate the datings already reached for the *Laudatio* and, by implication, for a whole group

<sup>11</sup> *Epistolae*, ed. Mehus, II, 110.

<sup>12</sup> ". . . quod est a Leonardo dictum in oratione illa in qua laudes florentinae urbis accuratissime conges- sit."

<sup>13</sup> *Dialogi*, ed. Klette, p. 68; ed. Garin, p. 76.

<sup>14</sup> For other points in Sabbadini's article of 1930 that turn out to be equally deceptive, compare *Crisis*, chapter 11, note 27, and *Crisis*, appendix 3, note 20.

of humanistic letters and translations whose dates are interdependent with the *Laudatio* date.

The first supplemental question requiring discussion is the exact year of that September day on which the *Laudatio* was just completed and shown to Bruni's friends. That this day was either the September 5 of 1403 or of 1404 results from the following conclusions: on the one hand, September 5, 1403 is the earliest September 5 on which Bruni could have referred, in his *Epistola I 8*, to the completion of the *Laudatio*; for, since Giangaleazzo's death had occurred on September 3, 1402, and had been kept secret for some time by the Milanese government, the writer of the *Laudatio* could not have known of the end of the Milanese threat if the text had been composed by the first few days of September 1402. On the other hand, Bruni's translation of Plato's *Phaedon*, which was in progress when *Ep. I 8* was written, was dedicated to Pope Innocent VII between December 1404 and the middle of March 1405. Consequently, the latest possible date for *Ep. I 8* and the completion of the *Laudatio* was September 5, 1404.<sup>1</sup>

The difficulty in making a conclusive choice between the alternatives of September 1403 and September 1404 is largely due to the insignificance of the changes in Bruni's life and in his Florentine environment during that span of time. But by a fortunate coincidence we have another Florentine work of which we know that it was published between the two dates in question: Salutati's *Invectiva*, released to the public some time after September 1403.<sup>2</sup> If we could determine whether the completion of the *Laudatio* fell either before or after the publication of the *Invectiva*, we should be able to date the *Laudatio* with precision.

As we shall see in section 4 of this chapter, we are in a position to demonstrate that Bruni, when writing his *Laudatio*, knew and used some of the passages added to the original draft of Salutati's *Invectiva* in 1402-03. Familiarity with the final version of Salu-

<sup>1</sup> On Giangaleazzo's death and the secrecy surrounding it, compare De Mesquita, *Giangaleazzo*, p. 298. On the date of the dedication of the *Phaedon* translation, see Bruni, *Schriften*, p. 161.

<sup>2</sup> Already mentioned pp. 23 and 52 above. Evidence will be adduced later, pp. 101 f.

tati's work does not, however, imply that the *Laudatio* was necessarily composed after the *Invectiva* had already been published. For Salutati did not publish his work on its completion, and Bruni, who lived in Florence in intimate friendship with Salutati, may be expected to have known the pamphlet before it was released to the public. Our investigation must, therefore, start from still more minute observations on the relationship between the text of the *Laudatio* and the text of the *Invectiva*.

In the sequence of events from the Florentine past presented in the *Laudatio* there is a striking gap which by implication might disclose some information about the background against which this account was written. The theory of the founding of Florence in the time of the Roman Republic is, as we know, the pivot of Bruni's claim that Florence had fallen heir to a great tradition of liberty.<sup>3</sup> In the historical appraisal, inserted in the *Laudatio*, of the development of ancient Rome from the Republic to the Despotism of the emperors, the high point is that it was the period of Roman freedom which saw the founding of Florence as a Roman colony. It is for this reason that Florence is thought to have been nursed on the Roman republican spirit and hatred of Empire and Tyranny, an attitude of mind that was once alive in medieval Guelph Florence, and was revived in the resistance to Giangaleazzo Visconti. Indeed, the significance of this foundation theory for Bruni's version of Florentine history is pointed out repeatedly. Such an origin, he comments, will "make it understood that this colony was conducted hither at the good time when the city of Rome saw her power, liberty, gifted minds, and the fame of her citizens in their greatest flower; for, according to Cornelius [Tacitus], after the republic had been subjected to the power of one man, those brilliant minds vanished." And again: the foundation of the city on the Arno took place "at the time when the empire of the Roman people was in its greatest flower, . . . and no defeat had yet been inflicted upon it by any enemy. It had not yet happened that the emperors, . . . the plague-spots and ruin of the republic, had robbed her of her liberty; inviolate,

<sup>3</sup> See p. 20 above.

unshaken, and thriving still was the freedom of which Rome was deprived by the most wicked thieves not long after this colony had been conducted hither. The result, I think, has been the situation which we have seen developing most perfectly in this city, in the past as well as at present; namely the fact that the Florentine people rejoice in every kind of liberty and stoutly show themselves the enemies of tyrants."<sup>4</sup>

In the face of this crucial role of the theory of the pre-imperial origin of Florence, it is puzzling to discover that Bruni fails to adduce any specific evidence for it. The public whom he was addressing in 1403 or 1404 could be expected to assume from what was found in the medieval chronicles that Caesar, builder of the Empire, had also founded Florence. Bruni's contentions, therefore, were bound to appear unworthy of credence and contrary to fact, unless his readers were already acquainted with the historical reconstruction by which the founding of the colony on the Arno was attributed to veterans of Sulla — the reconstruction first set forth in Salutati's *Invectiva* as our investigation has proved, and not already known since 1389.<sup>5</sup> Now it is clear that the public, in 1403/04, could not as yet have been familiar with Salutati's work, least of all the public outside of Florence where Bruni's panegyric was intended to proclaim the city as the legitimate heir of the *Res-*

<sup>4</sup> "Sed quorsum hec? . . . ut . . . intelligeretur eo tempore hanc coloniam deductam fuisse quo urbs Romana potentia, libertate, ingeniis, clarissimis civibus maxime florebat. Nam posteaquam res publica in unius potestatem deducta est, preclara illa ingenia (ut inquit Cornelius) abiere." *Laudatio*, L fol. 144v; ed. Klette, pp. 93 f. "Hec igitur splendidissima Romanorum colonia eo maxime tempore deducta est quo populi Romani imperium maxime florebat. . . . Nichil calamitatis populo Romano ab ullis hostibus inflictum erat. Nondum Cesaes, Antonii, Tiberii, Neronis, pestes atque exitia rei publicae, libertatem susculperant. Sed vigeat sancta et inconcussa libertas, quae tamen non multo post hanc coloniam deductam a sceleratissimis latronibus sublata est. Ex quo illud evenire arbitror quod in hac civitate egregie praeter ceteras et fuisse et esse videmus: ut Florentini homines maxime omnium libertate gaudeant et tyrannorum valde sint inimici." *Laudatio*, L fol. 142v-143r; ed. Klette, pp. 91 f.

<sup>5</sup> For two examples of the continued acceptance of the Florentine Caesar legend, one in 1395/96 (Filippo Villani), and the other not long after 1401 (Antonio degli Alberti), see above pp. 29 ff. For the critical digression in Salutati's *Invectiva*, and its genesis, see above pp. 19 f.

*publica Romana*. For even if the *Laudatio* was published as late as September 1404, it would have appeared eleven months at most after Salutati's *Invectiva*;<sup>6</sup> and if the publication of the *Laudatio* fell into the summer of 1403, it would even have preceded the release of Salutati's work. In either case, Bruni would have had every reason to verify his theory of the origin of Florence by specific reference to the veterans of Sulla. About a decade later, in the first book of his *History of the Florentine people*,<sup>7</sup> he did cite its founding by Sulla and his soldiers in the very first sentence of his historical account. There can be no doubt, of course, that when he wrote the *Laudatio* he was already acquainted with the results of Salutati's investigations. For without at least a cursory knowledge of the critical studies which Salutati had been pursuing through several years in repeated exchange with learned friends in and outside of Florence, Bruni could not have dared to assert the foundation of the city in republican times in the teeth of the fact that all medieval chroniclers gave Caesar as the founder.<sup>8</sup>

The failure of the *Laudatio*, then, to refer to Sulla, or to adduce any other definite facts or sources on so fundamental a matter, is so astonishing that Bruni must be assumed to have had some special motive for his silence. It would be difficult, however, to think of any other reason than that Bruni — though he knew Salutati's discoveries and relied on them for his own work, just as he knew and used Salutati's view of the Florentine-Milanese wars (as will be seen in the fourth section of the present chapter) — was either not yet sufficiently familiar with the details or, if he was, knew them from personal information and did not feel entitled to make public the results of Salutati's long efforts before they were published by the author himself.

Either motivation would have lost its basis by the summer of

<sup>6</sup> The publication date of Salutati's *Invectiva* was October 1403, or later, because on September 11 he had not yet overcome his last hesitations whether or not to publish the work, and because for the reasons discussed below p. 102, publication was still further delayed.

<sup>7</sup> Bruni, *Historiarum Florentini Populi Libri XII*, ed. E. Santini, in "Rerum Italicarum Scriptores," Nuova Ed., XIX, Parte III (Bologna, 1914-1926), p. 5.

<sup>8</sup> See *Crisis*, chapter 3, notes 30-33.



1404. Salutati's *Invectiva* had then been published; and though it was not yet known to a large public, there could have been no difficulty for a close friend of Salutati's in Florence to procure a manuscript, nor was there any reason left for hesitating to refer to the facts published by Salutati.

Quite different, however, the situation would be if the *Laudatio* was written in the summer of 1403. In that case we could well understand why the *Invectiva* was not yet quoted, nor its results used freely. The digression in Salutati's *Invectiva* on the origin of Florence was sent to Domenico Bandini d'Arezzo on July 21, 1403 with the request to make corrections or additions before the work was to be released for publication.<sup>9</sup> Not even among Salutati's Florentine friends, therefore, can the *Invectiva* have been in circulation by the end of July of that year, and even in August one could not refer to it in a normal fashion, because not until September 11 was the finished version dispatched to Pietro Turchi in Rimini<sup>10</sup> who had been the intermediary in acquainting Salutati with the Milanese challenge, written by Antonio Loschi, which Salutati's *Invectiva* was meant to answer.

Thus the dispatch to Turchi of Salutati's counter-manifesto, accompanied by the request to make it public among those who had read Loschi's anti-Florentine invective, would indicate the first possible moment when reference to Salutati's work would have been in order. But Salutati, who never before in his long life had written a humanistic invective, still hesitated even on September 11 to publish this personal attack against another humanist. Turchi received strict orders to circulate it only if Loschi's anti-Florentine libel had indeed spread widely. Otherwise the manuscript was to remain with Turchi "privately," that means, unpublished.<sup>11</sup>

Given Salutati's reluctance as late as September 1403 to allow his friends to make the *Invectiva* generally known, it follows that

<sup>9</sup> See above p. 23.

<sup>10</sup> Salutati, *Ep. XIII 10*, (1403, September 11), *Epistolario* vol. III, pp. 634 ff. (with Novati's comment in the note on pp. 634-636).

<sup>11</sup> See Salutati's instructions to Turchi in Salutati's *Ep. XIII 10* (1403, September 11), *Epistolario* vol. III, p. 640.

We must admit that our inferences, though plausible, do not amount to a final and altogether conclusive solution of the problem. We should, however, once more emphasize that the relative failure of our methods at this point is ultimately caused by the circumstance that for the interrelations between life and thought in the period of our study it does not matter a great deal whether the *Laudatio* was written in 1403 or 1404. Neither in the political situation of Italy nor in the climate of Florentine thought and opinion was there any substantial change during those two years of happy calm after the Florentine triumph of 1402; nor did any major change occur in the life of the author of the *Laudatio* until he exchanged the civic milieu of the Florentine City-state republic for the environment of the Roman Curia in 1405.

Whatever we have found about the conditions in which the *Laudatio* originated, applies, of course, equally to the dates of *Ep. I 8* and the beginning of Bruni's work on his *Phaedon* translation.<sup>13</sup>

#### 4. SALUTATI'S *INVECTIVA* AS A SOURCE OF BRUNI'S *LAUDATIO*

In our analysis of the *Laudatio*, we have noted that a peculiar trait of Bruni's eulogy is his misrepresentation of the events leading up to the peace of Venice in 1400.<sup>1</sup> For while this treaty, a most unfavorable settlement forced upon Florence by an understanding between Giangaleazzo and Venice, was in fact accepted by the Florentines with reluctance and grave misgivings,<sup>2</sup> the account in the *Laudatio* would make it appear as a humiliation of Giangaleazzo "begging for peace" after his defeat by Florentine arms.

In our discussion of this distortion of facts in the *Laudatio*, we also noted that the author could not have ventured upon this misrepresentation until the immediate effects of the peace of Venice

<sup>13</sup> On the interrelation which exists between these three works of Bruni we shall have more to say on pp. 114 ff., 120.

<sup>1</sup> See above pp. 85 f., 90 f.

<sup>2</sup> See "Introduction," above p. 6, and the analysis of the Florentine sentiment in "A Struggle for Liberty," p. 280 f.

had receded into the background, that is, not until Giangaleazzo's death.<sup>3</sup> Even then, however, Bruni—who was not a citizen at that time—would hardly have dared to offer so garbled an account of events still fresh in the memory of his contemporaries unless his rhetorical distortion of the picture of the past war was in agreement with the interpretations advocated by more authoritative men. From the comparison of the *Laudatio* with Salutati's *Invectiva* it can be ascertained that Salutati's way of presenting the facts *in maiorem gloriam* of Florence was entirely the same at the time when he finished his *Invectiva* in 1402–03. Indeed, Bruni's *Laudatio* seems merely to condense what is recounted in much more detail in Salutati's work. In the *Laudatio* we read. "With such a mind this commonwealth . . . met in strife the most powerful enemy that she compelled him who shortly before had menaced all Italy, believing that nobody could withstand him, to wish for peace and to tremble within the walls of Milan."<sup>4</sup> The following paragraphs in the *Invectiva* should be compared for the background of this claim. "In the second war," so Salutati tells of Giangaleazzo, "when he realized that the King of France had equipped an army, he became so extremely terrified that he, as if he had been vanquished, suffered the illustrious government of Venice with whom we were allied at that time, to arrange first for a truce and finally for the peace. Nor was a lord of such power ashamed to let this disgrace go unavenged," namely that of the defeat at Governolo, "and he accepted what peace terms he could get, like one who admits his defeat."<sup>5</sup> At another point we hear that Giangaleazzo, "beaten in the battle of Governolo, and fearing worse, suffered that the truce, and soon thereafter whatever peace he could get, was to be arranged by our allies the Venetians; and

<sup>3</sup> Above p. 91.

<sup>4</sup> Above p. 90 f.

<sup>5</sup> "Cum sensit secundo bello regium praeparatum exercitum, adeo perterritus est, quod bello sicut erat fractus, in manibus incliti dominii Venetorum, cuius fuimus illo tempore colligati, temporales inducias primo, pacemque postremo consensit. Nec puduit tantae potentiae dominum contumeliam non ulcisci," namely that of the defeat at Governolo, "et non aliter quam se victum fatens, quas potuit condiciones pacis accepit." Salutati, *Invectiva*, ed. Moreni, p. 176.

he who had sent to Tuscany, according to your [Loschi's] boast, four mounted legions, in order to reduce the glory and freedom of Florence under the yoke of his tyranny, he, when his hope was frustrated, humbly made peace."<sup>6</sup> There can be no question that these paragraphs belong to the portion of the text inserted in the *Invectiva* as late as 1402-03. This is proved by the unmistakably retrospective tone of the first passage as well as by its place in the extensive section toward the end of the *Invectiva* which, according to our analysis,<sup>7</sup> abounds with references to the situation of 1402 and 1403. If this is true of the first quotation, it will apply equally to the second, given the conformity of the contents, and the identity of a few words.

We can feel sure that, in the places cited, the *Laudatio* is dependent on the similar but more extensive and substantive account in Salutati's *Invectiva*; or, if there was personal contact between the two authors, relies on interpretations formed by Salutati for his propagandistic ends during his final work on the *Invectiva* in 1402-03. For it is difficult to see how else one could interpret the relationship between Bruni's daring, unexplained contention that Giangaleazzo in his war with Florence "trembled within the walls of Milan," and Salutati's plausible comment that France's decision to enter the war as Florence's ally made Giangaleazzo "so extremely terrified." The establishment of this relationship equips us with further evidence against the hypothesis—the gist of Kirner's theory—that the *Laudatio* was in substance composed as early as 1400 and supplemented after 1402 at the few points where post-1400 events are mentioned. For, in addition to the rare references to such events, we now know that some sections dealing with the situation of 1397-1400 also did not originate until the time of Salutati's final work on the *Invectiva* in 1402-03, or later.

<sup>6</sup>"... ut proelio [Moreni utpraelio] fractus apud Governum, maiora metuens per Venetorum colligatorum nostrorum manus inducias, moxque pacem, qualem habere potuit, consentiret; quique miserat in Tusciam quatuor, ut iactas, ... equitum legiones, ... Florentinam gloriam et libertatem sub iugum suae tyrannidis redacturus, spe sua frustratus, ... humiliter pacem fecit." *Ibid.*, p. 134.

<sup>7</sup>See above p. 59.

Yet the hypothesis of a lost, earlier version of the *Laudatio* is possible only — as Kirner himself knew — as long as we assume the supposed insertions to have been so insignificant that even without them the first version could still constitute a coherent work.<sup>8</sup>

We may add that, in consequence of these observations, Luiso's thesis — that the entire text of the *Laudatio* can be ascribed to the year 1400 after the apparent references to events of 1402 have been made innocuous by the interpretation that they really refer to earlier happenings — can now be attacked on the additional ground that some *Laudatio* passages have been found which positively originated after 1402. But the refutation of Luiso's theory by way of our approach from the political background appears so final that it does not seem necessary to follow any alternative avenue.

#### 5. A LETTER OF PIER PAOLO VERGERIO (*EPISTOLA* *LXXXXVI*) AND BRUNI'S *LAUDATIO*

One document, which at first sight would seem to contribute some touches to the background of the *Laudatio*, has not been used in our discussion. We are referring to a letter of Pier Paolo Vergerio, Bruni's fellow in the circles of Chrysoloras and Salutati until 1400 and, still after his departure from Florence, distinguished by Bruni through the dedication of the *Dialogi* to him. Vergerio's letter bears neither date nor address, apparently was never finished (it has been preserved incompletely), but is clearly intended for a Florentine.<sup>1</sup> It reports that Vergerio had been working on a piece of writing about the Florentine Republic. He still might complete the draft, Vergerio tells his unknown Florentine correspondent, but would not do so without his *bene placet*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Without the references to the events of 1397-1400, the very hinge of Bruni's account of the course of the war, the sections on Giangaleazzo can never have existed; and if we remove the Giangaleazzo sections completely, the *Laudatio* ceases to be a coherent work, as has been demonstrated on pp. 77 ff. above.

<sup>1</sup> *Ep. LXXXXVI* in Vergerio's *Epistolario*, ed. Leonardo Smith in "Fonti per la Storia d'Italia," vol. 74 (Rome, 1934), pp. 243-246.

<sup>2</sup> "Patrie vero tue potentia gloriaque admodum florenti letis animis faveo.

If this letter had indeed been written soon after Vergerio's departure from Florence in the spring of 1400 — during the latter part of 1400 or the next few years, the alternatives proposed by the editor of Vergerio's *Epistolario*<sup>3</sup> — we should have to conclude that Vergerio, immediately after his Florentine sojourn, was engaged in preparing a composition which may have represented a kind of counterpart to Bruni's *Laudatio*.<sup>4</sup> Since it must have been during the years Vergerio spent in Florence that he received the impressions which prompted him to undertake this labor, it is not unimportant for us to know whether Vergerio, at approximately the time when the *Laudatio* originated, was indeed this seriously occupied with the writing of a work on the *Respublica Florentinorum* that he corresponded about its possible publication with a Florentine acquaintance.

But is the letter in fact of so early a date? Vergerio informs us in it that he had not been able to carry his Greek studies in Chrysoloras' school to the point of complete proficiency, but had to continue them without a teacher, because "our master Manuel Chrysoloras went away unseasonably because of his fear of the onrushing wars — I don't know if I should say that we have lost him; the best and most learned man, whom your city had called from the heart of Greece to disseminate Greek studies in Italy. . . .

---

Cuius cum de republica iam ante scripsissem, scripta tamen nondum edidi. Que si emittere decrevero, nisi abs te prius visa, non edentur." *Ibid.*, p. 245.

<sup>3</sup>"1400-4 (?)." *Ibid.*, p. 243.

<sup>4</sup>Vergerio's uncompleted work "fa eco" to Bruni's *Laudatio*, as L. Smith puts it in the introduction to his edition of the *Epistolario*, p. XIX. In an article published in *Archivio Veneto*, Ser. V, vol. IV (1928), Smith also points out what he considers the significance of this parallel: "As to the chronology of Vergerio's development, we only want to emphasize the similar turn taken by Bruni's and Vergerio's studies about that time, as shown in Bruni's *Dialogus* and in Vergerio's project. The *Dialogus* presupposes the existence of Bruni's *Laudatio Florentinae urbis*; Vergerio in his letter tells us that he, too, had been drafting a piece on the same subject." ("Per la cronologia vergeriana vorremmo soltanto rilevare la comunanza di studi dimostrata dal dialogo dell'Aretino e dall'opera vergeriana circa questo tempo. Il dialogo presuppone l'esistenza della *Laudatio Florentinae urbis* . . . : il Vergerio . . . c'informa come anch' egli avesse abbozzato un lavoro su lo stesso argomento." Pp. 103 f.)

And if God let the Church be united and the Apostolic See reformed, he perhaps will find among the Italians a place worthy of him. . . . Meantime it is a shame that he, who is eager to be a Latin, is compelled not merely to continue as a Greek, but even to be exposed to constant danger of becoming a captive of barbarians."<sup>5</sup> It is from these passages that the recent editor concludes that the letter falls either into the time from the middle of 1403 to the end of 1404, when Chrysoloras was absent from Italy, or into an even earlier period, because, as he says, "the words 'went away unseasonably because of his fear of the onrushing wars' point to a date close to Chrysoloras' departure, in the year 1400, from Florence."<sup>6</sup>

Both of these conclusions, however, are shaky. The first fails to take account of later absences of Chrysoloras from Italy under quite similar circumstances. And Vergerio's mention of Chrysoloras' departure from Florence is not a report of a recent event but serves as an excuse for the inadequacy of his past training; he could have made the same remark equally well many years after Chrysoloras' departure. Nor is there justice in the assumption that a date close to 1400 is indicated by Vergerio's uncertainty whether or not Chrysoloras had been lost permanently to Italy as a teacher ("*preceptore . . . nescio an dicam ammisso*"); as we shall see, this issue was not resolved until several years after 1404.

The valid criteria for dating the letter must be sought elsewhere in its text; and we must also inquire more thoroughly into Chrysoloras' travels. To begin with this second problem, it can easily be settled today with the help of G. Cammelli's recent biography

<sup>5</sup>"... ablatō tempestive [or, rather, "intempestive"?] per metum ingruentium bellorum, nescio an dicam amisso, preceptore nostro Manuele Chrysolora, viro et optimo et doctissimo, quem ex intimo Grecie sinu ad seminandas in Italia grecas litteras tua civitas advocarat." (Vergerio, *Epistolario*, p. 244). "Atque hic [Chrysoloras] quidem, fortassis, si dederit Deus ut uniatur Ecclesia et reformetur Apostolica sedes, apud Italos locum se dignum inveniet. . . . Pudet tamen interea quod, cum cupiat esse Latinus, cogitur non tam Grecus perseverare quam perpetuo periculo subesse ne barbaris forsitan captivus fiat." (*Ibid.*, p. 245).

<sup>6</sup>"Le parole 'ablatō tempestive per metum ingruentium bellorum' indicano . . . una data vicina alla partenza di Crisolora da Firenze nel 1400." *Ibid.*, p. 243.

of Chrysoloras.<sup>7</sup> The precise time when Chrysoloras first left Italy was either March or April of 1403,<sup>8</sup> and Vergerio's letter, accordingly, must have been written after those months. The external circumstances of Chrysoloras' life would allow us to date the letter even as late as the end of 1407; for it was not until then that Chrysoloras' residence was finally transferred to Italy.<sup>9</sup> During the intervening years, he repeatedly traveled back and forth between Constantinople and Italy, and the dates of his voyages are known with fair accuracy: He was back in Venice in December 1404, but most of the year 1405 he spent once more in the East; in January 1406, we find him again in Italy — to be precise, in Venice and Padua — but by the end of 1406, if not much earlier, he had again moved back to his home in Constantinople, and there he remained until his definitive return to Italy at the end of 1407.<sup>10</sup> Each of these journeys across a sea infested with pirates and menaced by the Turks exposed him to the danger of becoming a captive of "barbarians" — just as Vergerio asserts in his letter.

But when, precisely, between April 1403 and the end of 1407, did Vergerio write his letter? There seems to be a clue in Vergerio's remarks that Chrysoloras might have a chance to find a position in Italy "if God lets the Church be united and the Apostolic See reformed" (*si dederit Deus ut uniatur Ecclesia et reformetur Apostolica sedes*), and that Chrysoloras "is eager to be a Latin" (*cum cupiat esse Latinus*). The reference, in particular, to a possibly impending settlement of the schism seems to leave open only one date within the period mentioned, for the following reason. Gregory XII, elected pope on November 30, 1406 (his predecessor, Innocent VII, had died on November 6, 1406), had sworn an oath even while he was still a cardinal that he would do everything in his power — including, if need be, his resignation — to end the schism; he renewed this oath voluntarily after his election. Bruni, who then served at the Curia, simultaneously with

<sup>7</sup> G. Cammelli, *I Dotti Bizantini e le Origini dell' Umanesimo*, vol. I: *Manuele Crisolora* (Florence, 1941).

<sup>8</sup> See Cammelli, *Manuele Crisolora*, p. 129.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 142-145.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 140-142.



Vergerio, phrased the decisive document in which the new pope, during the first days of December, promulgated these high-flung plans.<sup>11</sup> To such enthusiasm was Bruni inspired by the hopes of that moment that, when the Florentine chancellorship became vacant on December 9, 1406, he decided not to compete for it but to devote his efforts to that more exalted task — the union of the Church.<sup>12</sup> To be sure, if Vergerio's letter was written during those days of hope, it must have been written at the Curia, where he went after the disaster of the Carrara of Padua in the summer of 1405 — and not in Padua, as the editor of Vergerio's *Epistolario* indicates. And indeed, composition of the letter in Rome, where the new pope's personality and plans were well known, is just what one must expect in view of Vergerio's information and interest in the matter of Union.

We are also referred to Rome, and again to the year 1406, by Vergerio's note that Chrysoloras "*cupiat esse Latinus*." How could Vergerio have known about Chrysoloras' personal plans if he had been in Padua? But from the "register of supplications" in the Papal archives it has recently become known that toward the end of 1405 Chrysoloras applied from Constantinople to the pope for permission to take holy orders according to the rites of the Western Church — quite obviously a preparatory step to facilitate his permanent return to the West. This application was granted, and the grant was entered in the Papal registers on February 19, 1406.<sup>13</sup>

It is easy to imagine how this news — final proof of Chrysoloras' eagerness "to become a Latin" — must have spread and been discussed in the circle of Chrysoloras' friends and disciples at the Curia during the year 1406.

There is, finally, one more feature which would find a simple explanation if the letter had been written during the first few weeks of the pontificate of Gregory XII, but which would be difficult to account for in any other way. Why, we ask, did Vergerio

<sup>11</sup> F. Beck, *Studien zu Lionardo Bruni*, "Abhandlungen zur Mittleren und Neueren Geschichte," no. 36 (Berlin, 1912), pp. 15 f.

<sup>12</sup> See Bruni, *Ep. II 4*, ed. Mehus, I, 35.

<sup>13</sup> Cammelli, *Manuele Crisolora*, p. 141.

put so much stress on every aspect and every incident testifying to his contact with Florence and Florentine citizens when all these connections were a matter of the past? "It seems to me I have established close bonds with your *patria*," he begins his letter,<sup>14</sup> and then continues to tell of his maiden efforts as a lecturer in Florence at the time when he met the addressee of the letter; how later he had studied law and learned Greek in Florence, at a time when the addressee had already left his native city; how, apparently also many years ago, he had written something about the Florentine Republic — a work he might yet complete for publication if the addressee approved of it; and finally, how the Florentine custom most praiseworthy in his opinion was "that you admit foreigners to fill certain public offices."<sup>15</sup> All these references to past contacts and possible future services — do they not sound as if Vergerio had some special reason for trying to revive his Florentine connections? It has been noted that on December 9 the Florentine chancellorship became vacant unexpectedly, and that Bruni, unsuccessful candidate for it a few months earlier after the death of Salutati, now decided to continue in his curial office under the new pope. Three weeks later, on December 28, a Florentine, Pietro di ser Mino, was elected to the chancellorship.<sup>16</sup> We have seen from our previous observations that Vergerio's letter must have originated later than the first week of November 1406, but must have been written long before the end of 1407, because it reflects the hopes for reform characteristic of the early months of Gregory's pontificate. Under these circumstances it will not seem too bold to conjecture that it was precisely during those December weeks of 1406 when the Florentine chancellorship was open that Vergerio, with this office in mind, drafted his unfinished letter, which was to renew his connection with an influential Floren-

<sup>14</sup> "Multam contraxisse necessitudinem cum patria tua michi videor. . ." Vergerio, *Epistolario*, p. 243.

<sup>15</sup> " . . . quod externos admittitis ad quosdam gerendos magistratus." *Ibid.*, p. 246.

<sup>16</sup> We have already met Pietro as a character in Bruni's *Dialogi*, above p. 95; on Pietro di ser Mino and the Florentine chancellorship, see below pp. 161 ff.

tine acquaintance with whom he had not been in contact for many years, and was phrased so as to magnify the fact that at some time past he had had tender and sustained affiliations with Florence.

Obviously, if we accept personal hopes for a return to Florence as the motive prompting Vergerio's letter, the phrase "although I had written something about the Florentine Republic previously, I have not yet published it,"<sup>17</sup> must be taken with a grain of salt. Under the circumstances, these words may have been meant to serve their author as a recommendation, even if the work in question had not advanced very far.<sup>18</sup> But this conjecture can here be left *sub judice*. Whatever Vergerio's reasons for writing his letter, the fact that the letter cannot have originated before mid-November of 1406 eliminates it from the list of contemporaneous and primary sources for the years in which Bruni's *Laudatio* was written.

<sup>17</sup> See note 2 above.

<sup>18</sup> Actually we have sufficient indications that Vergerio's political convictions and interests, after his separation from Florence in the spring of 1400, had become those characteristic of north-Italian tyrant courts. See *Crisis*, chapter 6, section "Vergerio's return to Monarchy in Princely Padua," esp. note 25.

## CHAPTER V

### BRUNI'S DEVELOPMENT AS A TRANSLATOR FROM THE GREEK (1400-1403/04).

#### THE DATE OF HIS *EPISTOLA* 18

The dates of Bruni's beginnings as a politico-historical writer, and of his emergence as one of the pioneer Greek scholars, are closely related to each other. From his *Epistola* 18, we learn that he had begun to translate Plato's *Phaedon* at the moment when the *Laudatio* was ready for publication;<sup>1</sup> that is, the future translator of Plato and Aristotle then had attained his full mastery of Greek. The date of the *Laudatio*, therefore, determines the date of Bruni's maturity as a translator; and, conversely, final persuasion of any date proposed for the *Laudatio* depends on its ability also to fit into an intelligible history of Bruni's beginnings as a Greek student and translator.

As long as the *Laudatio* was surmised to have been written in 1400, and it consequently was found necessary to assume that *Ep. 18* originated in the same year, Bruni had to be thought of as capable of translating Plato in 1400. In our introduction we have already pointed out the improbability of such an assumption; but the dating of the *Laudatio* in 1400 has deflected Bruni scholars from a careful examination of the evidence we have on Bruni's progress as a student of Greek. Now that we know the fallacy of the ascription of Bruni's panegyric to the year 1400 and are sure that it cannot have been composed until 1403, or even 1404, what

<sup>1</sup> See above "Introduction," pp. 9 f., and pp. 72 f.

do the sources touching upon Bruni's early scholarly development reveal to a view no longer blocked by the artificial barrier of the 1400 chronology?

It should be stated at the outset that *Ep. I 8*, although it offers an essential aid for correlating the chronologies of the *Laudatio* and the *Phaedon* translation, cannot be positively dated on its own strength. It is true that the theory of the 1400 origin of the *Laudatio*, proposed by F. P. Luiso in 1901, included the assertion that early manuscripts of Bruni's letters confirmed *Ep. I 8* to have been written in 1400; but this assertion was made in error. On closer inspection, all the evidence Luiso (and subsequently R. Sabbadini who endorsed Luiso's chronology) was able to adduce<sup>2</sup> does no more than make composition of the letter in 1400 a possibility — one which remains relative to the date we accept for the *Laudatio* according to other testimony. If the date of the *Laudatio* can be fixed after 1402, then we may apply all of Luiso's arguments on *Ep. I 8* just as well to the years 1403 or 1404; and this on the following consideration: even though Luiso did prove that *Ep. I 8* is, as he puts it, "the oldest epistolary document from Bruni which we have,"<sup>3</sup> the circumstance that the second oldest piece preserved in the collection — *Ep. I 1* — is not older than April 3, 1405,<sup>4</sup> leaves for the preceding *Ep. I 8* a span of time long enough to include both the year 1400 and the first two years after 1402.<sup>5</sup> The only thing that can really be excluded is the attribution of

<sup>2</sup> Luiso, *Commento a Bruni*, pp. 86, 92, 94; Sabbadini, *Storia e critica*, pp. 78–80.

<sup>3</sup> "Il più antico documento epistolare che noi abbiamo del Bruni." Luiso, *Commento*, p. 94.

<sup>4</sup> That is, provided we do not count the recently found and published *Ep. XI 1* of February 1404 (see *Bruni, Schriften*, p. 222, later edited by E. Walser in *Atti dell' Accad. degli Arcadi 1928* [Rome, 1929], pp. 246–247) which, since it has been handed down outside of the collection of Bruni's correspondence (and has nothing in common with *Ep. I 8* in its contents), does not contribute to the problem of the sequence of the letters in question.

<sup>5</sup> Under these circumstances, even a discovery by which Luiso sets great store — that *Ep. I 8* appears as the first letter in manuscripts which (like the Cod. H. VI 26 of the Biblioteca Comunale di Siena) present Bruni's earliest correspondence without the later rearrangement for literary purposes — does not prove composition in 1400 rather than 1403 or 1404.

*Ep. I 8* to the year 1405, the date suggested by the place of the letter in the collection of Bruni's correspondence and sometimes accepted before Luiso.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup>*Ep. I 8* has come down to us with the date "Nonis Septembris" but without indication of the year. Mehus, in the introduction to his edition of Bruni's correspondence (p. LXI), conjectured the year 1405, presumably on the ground that the last dated preceding letter in the collection is of "II. Nonas Augusti 1405," and the next-following dated letter of "V Idus Martii 1406." Already A. Wesselofsky (introduction to the *Paradiso degli Alberti*, II, 209 f.) questioned this inference and proposed that, since the *Laudatio* in his opinion had been written before 1401 (Chapter IV, section 1, note 3), *Ep. I 8* cannot have originated later. From then on students realized that *Ep. I 8* posed a problem, as is indicated by Voigt's note (*Wiederbelebung*, II<sup>2</sup> [1881], 168; II<sup>8</sup> [1893], 166) he had "inferred" 1400 as the letter's date "from its reference to the '*Laudatio*,' and by the remark of G. Zippel in his *Niccolò Niccoli* (Florence, 1890), p. 19, that *Ep. I 8* "belongs probably to the year 1400 (*è probabilmente del 1400*)." It was Luiso who, in 1901, in his *Commento a Bruni*, working on a broadened basis of sources and manuscripts, finally undermined any lingering confidence in Mehus' conjecture and proposed an elaborate theory of the origin of *Ep. I 8* as well as of the *Laudatio* and the beginning of work on the *Phaedon* in 1400. Luiso's early dating of the letter has never seriously been challenged. (See Sabbadini's assent in *Storia e critica*; compare note 2 above.) When the present writer in 1928 composed his checklist of Bruni's correspondence, he wondered whether Luiso might not have overshot the mark, and whether *Ep. I 8*, though certainly not of 1405 origin, must not rather be dated 1403 or 1404. But it was impossible at that time to advance beyond establishing an alternative between 1400 and 1403/04 (*Bruni, Schriften*, pp. 159 f., 195 f.), because the decision cannot be made unless the dates of the other two works mentioned in *Ep. I 8*—the *Laudatio* and the *Phaedon* translation—are revised simultaneously. With our redating of the *Laudatio*, one corner of this triangle has been fixed; the present chapter, in reconstructing the history of Bruni's earliest translations from the Greek, will make it possible also to choose the final date for the *Phaedon* translation and *Ep. I 8*.

One argument set forth by both Luiso and Sabbadini is abortive and need not confuse the following discussion. Both scholars (in the places listed in note 2 above) make the point that the composition of *Ep. I 8*, which is dated not from Florence, but from a rather puzzling "villa Lazzanichi," would well fit into the year 1400 because a notorious plague raged in Florence that summer and caused many Florentines to seek safety out of town. But with equal, if not greater, plausibility it could also be argued that if Bruni, before writing his *Ep. I 8*, had left Florence to save himself from the plague, he would not coldly have instructed Niccoli about the *Laudatio* and told him of his enjoyment of Plato, without adding one brief word of anxiety about the health of his friends remaining amidst the horrors of an epidemic. We have all the less reason to deem Bruni capable of such callousness, as there is evidence of his reactions in a similar situation in the year 1407

The ultimate criterion then lies not only in the testimony of the *Laudatio* date, but also in our evidence regarding the dates of Bruni's early translations. Here the starting point must be the fact that, with the help of Bruni's prefaces to his two earliest translations, Basilus' *Homilia* and Xenophon's *Hieron*, we are in a position to form a clear idea of the extent to which he mastered the Greek language when he left the school of Chrysoloras in March 1400. As Bruni states in the dedication of Basilus' homily to Salutati, this work was meant to be a "first sample of his studies" (*degustatio quaedam studiorum meorum*), sent to his old teacher because he wished to receive encouragement through an authoritative *bene placet*. After obtaining it, he said, he would prepare "greater presents" (*maiora munuscula*) for Salutati.<sup>7</sup> With his next work, the translation of Xenophon's *Hieron*, Bruni did not yet feel he had reached this more advanced stage. In the preface addressed to Niccoli, he still revealed the frame of mind of a beginner. The little task at hand was undertaken, he maintained, for the sake of "practice" in translation ("*ingenii exercendi gratia*," "*cum exercere nos vellemus*"); "in these first fruits of our studies" (*in*

when, during his absence at the Curia, an outbreak of the plague produced the very conditions that Luiso and Sabbadini had in mind. At that time, in a letter to Niccoli who had remained in Florence (Salutati was dead by then), Bruni showed himself most deeply concerned about the danger threatening his friend, and strongly urged his quick departure before it was too late. (See the passage from Bruni's letter in *Bruni, Schriften*, p. 111, lines 30 f.). Nor is there any definite proof of the correctness of Luiso's identification of "villa Lanzanichi" with a place near Treviso in north-eastern Italy. It could also be another, still unidentified, place nearer to Florence (possibly the village in the territory of Pistoia, originally suggested by Sabbadini, in *Museo italiano di antichità classica*, III (1890), 328); and, anyway, Bruni's sojourn in the countryside early in September does not require a special explanation. Besides, if Bruni in 1400 had fled as far as the distant province of Treviso, how are we to harmonize with this the fact that later in his memoirs he simply reported that in the great plague of 1400 "most of the citizens" fled to Bologna? Should we think that he had been so exceptionally alarmed as to flee several times as far? (See *Rerum Suo Tempore Gestarum Commentarius*, ed. Di Pierro, p. 432.) Considering all this, Luiso's and Sabbadini's inferences regarding the plague of 1400 as the alleged background of Bruni's letter are hardly verifiable and extremely improbable.

<sup>7</sup> *Bruni, Schriften*, p. 99.

*his primitiis studiorum nostrorum*) he did not yet venture, he said, to grapple with Xenophon's "greater works" (*maiore opera*).<sup>8</sup> That the translation of Plato's dialogues was in the category of those "greater" tasks that had been still too difficult when he worked on Xenophon's *Hieron*, is a matter of course, but the fact was also expressly stated by Bruni himself when, in his maturity, he looked back upon the first twenty-five years of his activity as a translator. He then described his occupation with Plato and Aristotle as one of those labors which he attacked only at a time when he "already dared greater things" (*maiore iam ausi*).<sup>9</sup> Now at the time of the composition of *Ep. I 8*, his occupation with Plato was in full swing. Bruni, according to this letter, was already making broad plans; he looked upon the translation of the *Phaedon* as merely the first step toward rendering into Latin a substantial portion of the Platonic dialogues in a form worthy of Plato's style.<sup>10</sup> In spite of some customary expressions of modesty, there prevails throughout the letter the sovereign attitude of a craftsman confident of his ability and already feeling equal to the task of adequately appreciating and rendering a master of literary art who had been in obscurity for many centuries.

If Bruni was so far advanced in his skill when writing *Ep. I 8*, one wonders what period of time had been available to him for procuring the indispensable training. His first published translation, Basilus' *Homilia*, can hardly have been worked out before Chrysoloras' lectures in Florence came to an end in March 1400, by which time Bruni had been studying Greek for little more than two years. This inference is supported by the apparent connection of the *Homilia* translation with certain literary controversies of the Salutati circle which fall into the summer of 1400.<sup>11</sup> If the date of *Ep. I 8* were really September 5 of that year, Bruni would have traversed the whole arduous road, from his first at-

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 101.

<sup>9</sup> In the "Praefatio" to the translation of the *Phaedrus*, 1424; *ibid.*, p. 126, line 9.

<sup>10</sup> "Cuius ego libros si aliquando absolvero, et latinos, quemadmodum percipimus, effecero. . ." *Ep. I 8*, ed. Mehus, I, 16.

<sup>11</sup> *Bruni, Schriften*, pp. 160-161.



tempts at translations, still selected from among short and easy texts, to maturity in both translation and literary criticism, within one single spring and summer — something so improbable as to border on the impossible. In addition, we should be left with the further embarrassment that, whereas five summer months of the year 1400 would have to be crowded with the completion of two translations and the beginning of a third, this last (the *Phaedon*) would not have become ready for publication until four and a half years later (it was dedicated to Pope Innocent VII in the spring of 1405).

In the thus established frame we may place some statements of fact culled from Bruni's and Salutati's correspondence.

Two interesting bits of information can be gathered from *Ep. I 8* itself. First, when Bruni was writing the letter, he had the medieval translation of the *Phaedon* by Henricus Aristippus at hand; and, second, the request to undertake a fresh translation had been conveyed to him by Salutati.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, we have a letter of Salutati, written May 24, 1401 to Giovanni Conversino da Ravenna in Padua, which allows us to trace Salutati's part in the undertaking.<sup>13</sup> Salutati had asked Conversino to send him, besides Chalcidius' translation and annotation of Plato's *Timaeus*, "the *Phaedon* of Plato" (*Phedonemque Platonis*);<sup>14</sup> this can only mean the medieval translation of the *Phaedon* by Henricus Aristippus. Also, we gather from Salutati's letter that his efforts to secure these two works of Plato in Latin had begun earlier, presumably the year before (1400), when Conversino had been in Florence as a Paduan envoy.<sup>15</sup> Finally, the letter tells us how anxiously Salutati had been awaiting the two Plato translations. "But now you must recall," he writes to Conversino, "how eagerly I impor-

<sup>12</sup> For the identification of the medieval translation consulted by Bruni, see Luiso, *Commento a Bruni*, p. 88, and Revilo P. Oliver, "Plato and Salutati," *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, LXXI (1940), p. 320. See also notes 18, 19 below.

<sup>13</sup> Salutati, *Ep. XII 10, Epistolario* vol. III, pp. 511-515. For the time of the letter see the Excursus, which follows, on "The Date of Salutati's *Epistola XII 10*."

<sup>14</sup> Salutati, *Ep. XII 10, Epistolario* vol. III, p. 515.

<sup>15</sup> On this visit see p. 124 below.

tuned you with my request [during Conversino's visit in Florence 1400] to lend me Plato's *Timaeus* and *Phaedon* and Chalcidius' commentary, in order that I could have them copied. Therefore, I beg of you by the bond of our friendship and the sacred union of our mutual affection and love, to grant my wish the sooner the better."<sup>10</sup> How, therefore, could Salutati in 1400 and still in the spring of 1401 be so fervidly interested in securing the Aristippian *Phaedon* from abroad, if Bruni, with whom he was in intimate personal contact and literary exchange, was in possession of the text in September 1400 and was using it to make a new translation of the *Phaedon* at Salutati's request? We cannot solve this puzzle in any other way than by concluding that Bruni was not yet occupied with his translation of the *Phaedon* when Salutati was looking for the Aristippian translation outside of Florence. Accordingly, the earliest possible date for Bruni's work on the *Phaedon* and, consequently, for the composition of *Ep. I 8*, was the summer of 1401.

The establishment of the summer of 1401 as a *terminus a quo* not only means that the *Phaedon* translation had not been under way as early as 1400, but also implies that it was not begun until two or three years later. For since the *Phaedon* was taken up on the completion of the *Laudatio*, and the *Laudatio*, if it cannot be dated 1400 (before the *Dialogi*), must be dated the summer either of 1403 or of 1404 (that is, after the end of the Giangaleazzo war), there exists a corresponding alternative for the date of the *Phaedon* translation: if it was not begun in the summer of 1400, it must have been begun as late as the summer of 1403 or 1404.

The course of events leading up to Bruni's translation of the *Phaedon* must, then, have been as follows: In May 1401, Salutati asked Giovanni Conversino for the medieval Latin versions of the *Phaedon* and the *Timaeus*. From a later bit of information we learn that Conversino sent to Salutati the *Timaeus* before the year was up; for in December 1401, Salutati had available and in use a text (and this can only mean Chalcidius' Latin translation) of

<sup>10</sup> Salutati in the quoted letter *Ep. XII 10, loc. cit.* For the Latin text see note 8 to the Excursus which follows.

the *Timaeus*.<sup>17</sup> Even if we had no further evidence, it would be probable that Conversino at about the same time also complied with Salutati's wish regarding Aristippus' Latin *Phaedon*, and that Salutati's acquisition of this text explains why Aristippus turned up in Bruni's hands. But, in addition, we are fortunate in that the manuscript then written to Conversino's order and sent to Salutati has been found; it contains both the *Timaeus* and the *Phaedon*.<sup>18</sup> As a consequence, we may consider it a fact that the *Phaedon*, too, was in Salutati's possession by December 1401.<sup>19</sup> After examining the manuscript, Salutati obviously was not satisfied with the medieval version and, therefore, handed it to Bruni, in order that it might aid the young Hellenist in a fresh humanistic rendering of the Greek original. Whether this happened as early as the end of 1401 or only some years later, we are unable to tell from Salutati's letters. But since Bruni's translation was undertaken in direct response to Salutati's request (according to the account in *Ep. I 8*), Salutati presumably encouraged Bruni to do the work when he knew that Bruni had mastered Greek thoroughly. This reconstruction of the history of Bruni's early activity as a translator gives an intelligible account by leaving room for a gradual development.

An implication of our result is the complete destruction of the last of the arguments which would allow ascription of *Ep. I 8*, and indirectly the *Laudatio*, to the year 1400.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>17</sup> According to *Ep. XII 24, Epistolario* vol. III, p. 559.

<sup>18</sup> It is Cod. Vat. Lat. 2063. This manuscript shows the customary identification mark of the volumes from Salutati's library, as well as notes in Salutati's hand, and has been identified by R. Klibansky, B. L. Ullman, and A. Campana. See the description of the manuscript in the edition of *Phaedo Interprete Henrico Aristippo*, L. Minio-Paluello ed., in "Corpus Platonicum Medii Aevi" (London, 1950), p. XIII.

<sup>19</sup> It follows that Minio-Paluello's findings (see *Phaedo Interprete Henrico Aristippo*, p. XIII) — that Vat. 2063 was written "after the middle of 1401, possibly before the middle of 1402" — can be refined further: the codex was written between May and December of 1401.

<sup>20</sup> The redating of *Epistola I 8* also affects the question when Bruni became acquainted with Cicero's *Epistolae Familiares*, rediscovered in 1392 (the second Ciceronian epistolary corpus, the *Epistolae ad Atticum*, remained unknown to him until 1406/08, as Sabbadini, *Storia e Critica*, pp. 76-78, 80, has proved). There can be no doubt that one passage in *Ep. I 8*

## Excursus

THE DATE OF SALUTATI'S *EPISTOLA XII 10*

Any reconstruction of Bruni's development as a translator from the Greek must rely extensively on a letter from Salutati to Giovanni Conversino da Ravenna, *Epistola XII 10* in Novati's edition. In this letter, Salutati asks Conversino to get him a copy of Plato's *Phaedon*, meaning, as has been noted, the medieval Latin translation by Henricus Aristippus. We can be sure that Salutati was in possession of an Aristippus text by December 1401, and we also know from Bruni's *Epistola I 8* that Bruni had Aristippus' translation on his desk when translating the *Phaedon* at Salutati's request.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, by establishing the date of Salutati's *Ep. XII 10*, we may obtain a further *terminus a quo* for Bruni's *Ep. I 8* and the beginning of his *Phaedon* translation, as well as for the time of the completion of the *Laudatio* simultaneous with *Ep. I 8*.

Salutati's *Ep. XII 10*, though dated May 24, has come down to us without an indication of the year, and Novati, ascribing the letter to 1401 on the strength of various criteria, cautiously left a question mark attached to the date. When Luiso endeavored to place Bruni's *Ep. I 8* in 1400, he could not do so without also calling into doubt Novati's attribution of Salutati's letter to 1401, and proposing for it a pre-1400 date.<sup>2</sup> As the following comment will show, Luiso's objections to Novati's arguments were not well-founded in any respect; whereas Novati's dating in 1401 can be buttressed by fresh observations.

The date proposed by Novati was disputed by Luiso chiefly with the thesis that the period referred to in Salutati's letter — when Bruni "devoted himself to the study of civil law (*qui licet iuris civilis doctrine vacet*)" while "burning with *totius humanitatis et poetarum studio*" — was not, as Novati assumed, the time between 1401 and Bruni's departure from Florence to the Curia (in 1405), but the earlier period of Bruni's legal studies which began about 1395 and ended in 1397 with the arrival of Chrysoloras.

A close examination of these assertions shows that Luiso here, as so often in his study, actually does no more than point out the possibility

---

paraphrases a sentence from Cicero's *Fam. IX 14.5*. From this fact, Sabadini has argued that Bruni must have known Cicero's *Familiares* in 1400 (*Storia e Critica*, pp. 78, 80). That date in the history of Cicero's Renaissance influence may now be changed to 1403/04.

<sup>1</sup> All these facts have been discussed pp. 119-121.

<sup>2</sup> Luiso, *Commento a Bruni*, pp. 88 f., 94.

of an alternative chronology, only to link the interpretations of several sources in a *circulus in probando*. He argues that Salutati's letter cannot belong to the later period (1401–1405) because the letter shows Salutati searching for the Latin *Phaedon* of Aristippus, whereas Bruni, partner in Salutati's studies, did have an *Aristippus* when writing his *Ep. I 8*. This letter of Bruni in turn, says Luiso, was written in 1400, first, for the several reasons which we discussed (and refuted) earlier in this chapter, and secondly, because Salutati's letter need not prevent us from dating Bruni's *Ep. I 8* in 1400, on the ground that Salutati's letter can very well stem from the period between 1395 and 1397 if other reasons suggest that it was written earlier than 1400.

This argument ignores that Novati had adduced one matter-of-fact observation which, independently of any comparisons with other sources, makes it at least very doubtful that Salutati's letter falls as early as 1396/97 (as Luiso would date it). Salutati's letter, Novati had emphasized, calls, in a significant place of its context, an event of 1393 "such a great number of years" past.<sup>3</sup> Does this expression not exclude a time only three or four years after that event? The power of conviction carried by Novati's argument can be enhanced by some consonant findings. Bruni, in Salutati's letter, is called "*vir*" and "*dominus*,"<sup>4</sup> a designation certainly inappropriate to a student at most twenty-seven years of age (as Bruni would have been in 1397). Furthermore, Bruni appears in the letter as Salutati's intimate associate in the humanistic studies who regularly visits him for conversation on their common interests "as is our custom" (*veluti mos noster est*), and in every respect is Salutati's esteemed "friend," not an immature beginner.<sup>5</sup> This is quite in order if the letter was written in 1401, for, from that year on, Bruni frequently appears in a similar relationship in Salutati's correspondence.<sup>6</sup> On the other hand, we have no reason to believe that Bruni, who is never mentioned in Salutati's letters prior to 1401, was in such intimate contact with him as early as about 1396.

Novati's opinion that, within the period 1401–05, the year 1401 is the most probable, was also based on well-considered reasons. Here Novati obviously drew his conclusion that May 1402 would be too late but May 1401 appears appropriate, from the fact that Chalcidius' Latin translation of the *Timaeus*, listed by Salutati as a desideratum along with Aristippus' *Phaedon*, was in Salutati's possession by Dec-

<sup>3</sup> "Tot annis." Salutati, *Ep. XII 10, Epistolario* vol. III, p. 512, line 6. See Novati's comment, *ibid.*, p. 511.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 513.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 514–515.

<sup>6</sup> Beginning September 25, 1401; see *Ep. XII 21, Epistolario* vol. III, 547.

ember 16, 1401. Since Novati's studies, we have learned that Salutati's request for Aristippus, too, had been satisfied by that time.<sup>7</sup> These observations can be reinforced by the discovery of allusions in Salutati's letter to an event which fell into the year 1400 and was not yet long past when the letter was written. Some passages in Salutati's letter imply that a personal meeting between Salutati and Conversino had shortly preceded the letter. Apart from the introductory words, such a meeting is suggested in the paragraph in which Salutati asks for books: "But now you must recall how eagerly I importuned you with my request to lend me Plato's *Timaeus* and *Phaedon* and Calcidius' commentary in order that I could have them copied. Therefore, I beg you by the bond of our friendship and the sacred tie of our mutual affection and love, to grant my wish the sooner the better."<sup>8</sup> If Salutati's earlier request had been made in a letter, one would not expect him to say "But now you must recall how eagerly I importuned you with my request." However, Salutati's way of expression fits perfectly a situation in which he had made a request, and Giovanni had given a promise, at the occasion of a personal meeting, and now Salutati was using his first opportunity to make sure his friend would keep the promise. Precisely this situation holds for Salutati and Giovanni early in 1401. In the beginning of 1400, Giovanni had been in Florence on a political mission of the Paduan *Signore*, and had seen Salutati;<sup>9</sup> and recently R. Sabbadini has shown that Giovanni throughout the remainder of that year was occupied with two other diplomatic commissions, to Bologna and Rome, which kept him away from home.<sup>10</sup> He returned to Padua toward the end of 1400, and, consequently, the spring of 1401 was the appropriate time for Salutati to remind Giovanni of a promise the fulfilment of which required consultation of Paduan libraries.

On the strength of these observations it appears that the date May 24, 1401, proposed, with a cautious reservation, by Novati for Salutati's letter, is final and may be used as a link in reconstructing the chrono-

<sup>7</sup> Above p. 121. Novati's reference to Salutati's possession of the *Timaeus* in December 1401, is in *Epistolario* vol. III, p. 515.

<sup>8</sup> "Nunc autem reminisci debes quam cupide te gravarim, ut Thimeum Phedonemque Platonis commentumque Calcidii quoad rescribi facerem commodares. Qua re te deprecor per amicitie nostre vinculum et sanctissimam necessitudinem mutue dilectionis et amoris, quatenus quantocius fieri potest me compotem voti reddas." Salutati, *Ep. XII* 10, p. 515.

<sup>9</sup> See Salutati's *Ep. XI* 11 of February 3, 1400, addressed to Conversino immediately after the latter's departure from Florence; *Epistolario* vol. III, pp. 375 f.

<sup>10</sup> R. Sabbadini, *Giovanni da Ravenna, Insigne Figura d'Umanista* (Como, 1924), pp. 80 ff., esp. 86.

logy of Bruni's early literary works. If this conclusion is accepted, the date of *Epistola XII 10* becomes another decisive obstacle to the ascription of Bruni's *Phaedon* translation — and, by the same token, of the *Laudatio* — to the year 1400.

## CHAPTER VI

### BRUNI'S

#### *DIALOGI AD PETRUM PAULUM HISTRUM*

##### 1. A NEW THEORY: SUCCESSIVE COMPOSITION OF THE TWO DIALOGUES IN 1401 AND AFTER 1402

The chronological evidence established for the *Laudatio* affects the dates of all of Bruni's early writings. To summarize the intertwining facts examined to this point: the composition of the *Laudatio* after the crisis of 1402 determines the date of *Epistola I 8* which presupposes the recent completion of the *Laudatio*. Again, the fact that *Epistola I 8* was written in the autumn of 1403 or 1404 allows one to see that Bruni's development as a translator from the Greek took place gradually in the span of time stretching from 1400 to 1403/04.

An even more momentous consequence of this revision of the chronology of Bruni's beginnings is that the citation of the *Laudatio* in the second part of the *Dialogi* can no longer be thought to have been made in the year 1401. As the text of the *Dialogi* at several points indicates that the dedication and the beginning of the first dialogue were penned not later than 1401,<sup>1</sup> the inescapable conclusion seems to be that *Dialogus II* (the conversation on the second day) was added in 1403/04, or even later, to the dedication and first dialogue written in 1401.

In a chapter of this writer's *Crisis of the Early Italian Renais-*

<sup>1</sup>As we shall see in the section "The Date of *Dialogus I*," later on in this chapter.



sance an effort has been made to discover whether there can be found any seams in the text of the *Dialogi* revealing the lack of cohesion one would expect in a composition not made all at one time; also, the question has been asked whether *Dialogus I* and *Dialogus II* differ in any substantial respect in form or spirit.<sup>2</sup> The principal results of those examinations are that Bruni's dedication to Vergerio talks of one "*disputatio*," described "*in hoc libro*," although there are two "*libri*" or "*dialogi*"; and that the dedication refers to a gathering "in Salutati's house" ("*apud Colucium*"), while the second disputation does not take place in Salutati's house, but on a rural estate of Roberto de' Rossi. Again, in the first conversation there is no foreshadowing of, or preparation for, a second gathering. A feature sharply distinguishing the two parts is the naive and realistic reproduction of Florentine life in the first dialogue, as against the unmistakable imitation of a classical literary model in the second. Also, the depiction of the personal relations between the members of Salutati's group, and of their individual attitudes toward the Florentine Commonwealth and its cultural traditions, varies considerably. For instance, the militant aggressiveness of the classicist Niccoli in the first dialogue, directed against the three great Florentine poets of the Trecento, is so profoundly different from Niccoli's conciliatory tone and his reverence for Florence's Trecento heritage in the second part, that the meaning of the *Dialogi* as a whole has been interpreted in the most conflicting fashions. There are irreconcilable differences between the Salutati of the first dialogue and the Salutati of the second, and between the two portraits which Bruni draws of himself in the two parts. In the first dialogue, Salutati is made to say that Bruni was looking upon Niccoli's militant classicism as his own cause; in the second, Bruni stands side by side with Salutati in the defense of the glory which has accrued to Florence from the works of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio. He now appears as the champion of a public-spirited civic attitude, is praised as the author of his patriotic-minded Florentine eulogy, and receives the

<sup>2</sup> See *Crisis*, chapter 11, sections "The Literary Structure of the *Dialogi*" and "*Dialogus I* of 1401 and the Post-1402 Origin of *Dialogus II*."

acclamation of his friends for the republican interpretation of Roman and Florentine history set forth in the *Laudatio*.

Does the concurrence of so many observations all pointing in the same direction mean that even the old puzzle of Bruni's *Dialogi* can be solved when adequate attention is paid to the political aspects of the literature of the early Quattrocento? Before we venture to assert that much, we must be sure that all the evidence which in the past seemed to point the way to a pre-1402 origin and a homogeneous picture of Bruni's two dialogues can actually be turned toward the new interpretation. We must be able to answer searching questions like the following: is the hypothesis that *Dialogus I*, together with the dedicatory letter, was issued at a time when *Dialogus II* was not yet in existence, encouraged or at least not obstructed by the evidence from the available manuscripts? And is the plural form of the title "*Dialogi*" no obstacle to the theory of successive publication? Moreover, when the conclusion has been reached that *Dialogus II* must have been written after 1402, can we be absolutely sure after all that the first dialogue and the dedication might not also have originated after 1402? And, finally, does the assertion that *Dialogus II* was added in 1403/04, or later, agree with the facts known of Bruni's life in the period subsequent to the year 1402?

All these remaining doubts we will try to remove in the present chapter.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Whenever Bruni's *Dialogi* is cited in the present work, page references will be to two editions: *Leonardi Aretini ad Petrum Paulum Istrum Dialogus*, ed. Th. Klette in his *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Litteratur der Italienischen Gelehrtenrenaissance*, vol. II (Greifswald, 1889), pp. 39-83; and the reissue of Klette's text by E. Garin in his *Prosatori Latini del Quattrocento*, vol. 13 of the series "La Letteratura Italiana. Storia e Testi" (Milan, 1952), pp. 39-99. Garin, besides adding an Italian translation, has revised Klette's punctuation and has occasionally corrected the text on the basis of Florentine manuscripts. We have followed this greatly improved version in our quotations.

The good edition, *I 'Dialogi ad Petrum Histrum' di Leonardo Bruni*, ed. G. Kirner (Leghorn, 1889), rarely available in libraries outside of Italy, rests on a similar, though narrower manuscript basis; while a third edition, published at Vienna, also in 1889, *Leonardo Bruni Aretini Dialogus De Tribus Vatribus Florentinis*, ed. K. Wotke, reproduces a more corrupt textual tradition.

2. ONE-DIALOGUE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE *DIALOGI*

The textual critic of Bruni's *Dialogi* must find an explanation for an unusual fact in the transmission of the work: there exists a version — limited though it is to a small group of manuscripts — in which the work contains only the *Prooemium*, addressed to Pier Paolo Vergerio, and the first dialogue. Since practically all the contradictions that have embarrassed students of the *Laudatio* and the *Dialogi* in the past would disappear if this one-dialogue version were the first form of the work and the second dialogue were a later addition,<sup>1</sup> it is of great importance to find out whether we have sufficient reason to believe that the one-dialogue version descended from such early roots that it may be transmitting the state of the work in 1401. A solution of all the secondary problems involved would require a systematic collection of the widely scattered manuscripts. But even limiting our investigation to occasional finds and the available printed descriptions of manuscripts, we are sufficiently equipped to answer some of the basic questions on the history of the text.<sup>2</sup>

The literary fortunes of the *Dialogi* bear eloquent witness to the role of its shorter version. The printed edition in which the humanistic reading public of the sixteenth century knew Bruni's work (published at Henricpetri's in Basel in 1536) contained only the *Prooemium* and *Dialogus I*.<sup>3</sup> Since the edition published at

<sup>1</sup> See above p. 126.

<sup>2</sup> The basis of the following investigations into the manuscript evidence for the *Dialogi* is: 1) the information on manuscripts given in 1889 by Kirner, Klette, and Wotke in the introductions to their editions; 2) information found in published catalogues of manuscripts, and in miscellaneous monographic studies; 3) casual consultation of manuscripts in Florentine and Roman libraries by the writer at the occasion of researches on related subjects, in the years 1925-1928 and 1934-1935; 4) information on a number of Vatican manuscripts kindly sent in 1946 by the Administration of the Vatican Library at the writer's request; 5) microfilms and photostats of some manuscripts of the Biblioteca Vaticana, the Biblioteca Laurenziana, the Biblioteca Riccardiana, and of the libraries at Reims and Karlsruhe.

<sup>3</sup> For the print of 1536 (according to the title page; the printer's note on the last folio gives the year 1530), see Kirner in his edition, p. XXIII, and Voigt, *Wiederbelebung*, I<sup>a</sup>, 384.

Nuremberg in 1734 merely reproduced the edition of 1536,<sup>4</sup> general knowledge of the *Dialogi* remained restricted to these portions of the work until the latter part of the nineteenth century. The second dialogue was not put into print until as late as 1889.

Did the printing history of the *Dialogi* take these unusual turns because it had been preceded by a long one-dialogue tradition in the manuscript stage? At first sight, the precise circumstances known of the Basel publication seem to speak against such an assumption. In the preparation of the edition at Henricpetri's, a manuscript was used which contained both dialogues. This manuscript, now Basel O.II.32, was adapted by the editor before being sent to the printers: the second dialogue was cancelled, while a title (*Libellus de disputationum exercitationisque studiorum usu . . .*) indicating the limitation to one "book," and referring to the subject matter of the first dialogue, was entered in the manuscript which originally had not borne any title.<sup>5</sup> So the first impression is that the proffered hypothesis is stillborn. Possibly for this reason the problems so distinctly posed by the occurrence of an incomplete version have never been pondered. For since Klette's introduction to his publication of the *Dialogi* in 1889 the arbitrary act of omission by the Basel editor has been well known to scholars.

Nevertheless we need only reflect on the reasons which may have moved the Basel editor to so reckless a handling of his manuscript to recognize that the matter cannot be closed without some further questions. In particular, may it not be that the editor felt justified to commit the mutilation because he knew that the first dialogue had sometimes been circulated in separate manuscripts? And was the inserted title a bold-faced invention, or has the chosen version anything in common with the title of older manuscripts containing the first dialogue only?

<sup>4</sup>For the print of 1734 see Klette in his edition, p. II, and Voigt, *Wiedergeburt*, I<sup>3</sup>, 384.

<sup>5</sup>Klette in his edition, pp. I, IV, 39. The full title of the Basel edition is "Libellus de disputationum exercitationisque studiorum usu, adeoque necessitate in literarum genere quolibet." (From a copy in the Newberry Library in Chicago.) For further details see below section 3, note 13.

The first observation we make in working our way back from the Basel edition of 1536 is that a manuscript limited to the first dialogue had migrated from northern Italy to upper Germany two generations earlier. It had been brought home by the Nuremberg patrician and humanist Hartmann Schedel, who had copied it while studying in Padua from 1464 to 1466. Between 1472 and 1485, the first dialogue alone was again copied by Hartmann's cousin, Hermann Schedel, another well-known humanist of the Nuremberg circle.<sup>6</sup> Tracing the matter further, we find no reason to suspect that Hartmann Schedel himself had been guilty of mutilation by copying only the first half of a two-dialogue version. For, although the preserved manuscripts and literary traces of the one-dialogue tradition are still awaiting systematic investigation, this much at least can be said with certainty: one-dialogue manuscripts were not entirely unknown among Italian humanists around the middle of the 1460's; manuscripts of this type had existed even at a much earlier time.

If we turn to Florence, where Bruni's work was written, we find among the manuscripts there at least one which contains the preface and *Dialogus I* only — MS. 976 of the Biblioteca Riccardiana.<sup>7</sup> To judge from the script, this manuscript belongs to the earlier

<sup>6</sup> Cod. Monacensis 350, written by Hartmann Schedel 1464–1466 in Padua, fol. 9r–17v: "Leonardi Aretini dialogus ad Petrum." See *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis*, ed. altera, vol. I, pars I (1892), pp. 90–91. For the origin of this manuscript during Schedel's sojourn at Padua, see also R. Stauber, *Die Schedelsche Bibliothek*, in the series "Studien und Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte," vol. VI, no. 2/3 (Freiburg, Br., 1908), p. 47. Hermann Schedel's transcript, with the title *Leonardi Aretini Dialogus*, is found on the end papers of an incunabulum of 1472; see Stauber, p. 157. Hence its date is between 1472 and 1485, the year of Hermann's death. Hermann and Hartmann, both medical men, had lived in intimate humanistic and professional relations in Nuremberg from 1467. (Stauber, pp. 21, 23.)

<sup>7</sup> Cod. Riccardianus 976 (S. I. No. XXIX). See G. Lami, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum qui in Bibliotheca Riccardiana Florentiae adservantur* (Leghorn, 1756), p. 262; Klette, in his edition, p. IV; Kirner, in his edition, p. XXIV f. This manuscript has been used by Klette and by Kirner in their editions of the *Dialogi*, but they give no precise indications of script and content. Prof. P. O. Kristeller has done me the great favor of examining the manuscript and sending a list of the content. I have also seen a photostat of the leaves 26v–34r which contain the *Dialogus I*.

part of the Quattrocento.<sup>8</sup> It is a humanistic miscellany which contains writings of contemporaneous authors, including addresses, held on particular occasions, that must have been copied from manuscripts not commonly available for transcription; it would not be surprising if the same held true for the manuscript this copyist consulted for Bruni's work. The text of *Dialogus I* given here is among the best we have, and there can hardly have been much copying and recopying between the archetype and this transcript. This manuscript, then, may indicate that the one-dialogue tradition goes back to the very time when Bruni's work had just begun to be available to copyists. On the other hand, there is no definite evidence in the Riccardiana text (which has no title or subscription by the scribe) that the scribe's model had been limited, like the copy, to the preface and the first dialogue. The conclusiveness of our hypothesis thus depends on whether additional evidence of the one-dialogue version can be found elsewhere.

The existence, about the middle of the Quattrocento, of the one-dialogue version in central Italy may be indicated by the following clue. A copy of Salutati's treatise *De Tyranno*, preserved in a manuscript of the Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele in Rome,<sup>9</sup> contains marginal notes by a republican-minded reader who attacks Salutati for his defense of Dante's admiration of Caesar and the Roman imperial Monarchy. Bruni, this commentator remarks in one of his annotations, having been "better informed" and an "abler writer" than Salutati, "had reproached Dante in his *dyalogus*, and indeed most bitterly."<sup>10</sup> Since no one who has read the rehabilitation of Dante in *Dialogus II* and the express recantation there of the previous attacks, could see in Bruni's attitude an unqualified reproach of Dante, we may suspect that the commentator knew Bruni's work from a manuscript restricted to the first dialogue. This commentator, who betrays

<sup>8</sup> That is, the major portion of the manuscript, fol. 3-40. The Italian poetry at the beginning and at the end is in a sixteenth-century hand.

<sup>9</sup> Cod. Sessorianus 1443. See below note 11.

<sup>10</sup> Bruni, "instructor et eloquentior, . . . in suo dyalogo reprehendit Dantem, et maxime quidem."

close familiarity with the Florentine republican interpretation of Roman history, could have belonged to the circle of Roman republicans around Stefano Porcari, who, during his term of office as Florentine *capitano del popolo* in 1427, had learned to admire the Florentine attitude.<sup>11</sup> But with this clue, too, we have not yet established more than a possibility.

In the mid-1460's, when Schedel made his copy at Padua, Bruni had been dead for twenty years. Lists of his writings were already current in humanistic bio-bibliographies such as the two works published both under the title "De viris illustribus" by Enea Silvio Piccolomini, and by Bartolommeo Fazio, a Genoese, about 1450.<sup>12</sup> While the title given in Fazio's account is obviously corrupt — *Dialogorum Liber*, meaning *one* "book" containing *several* "dialogues," which is monstrous from the viewpoint of classical and Bruni's own literary usage<sup>13</sup> — the title given by Enea Silvio

<sup>11</sup> The marginal notes of the Cod. Sessor. 1443 are published in the edition of *De Tyranno* by F. Ercole, pp. 192 f. (republished in Ercole's *Da Bartolo all' Alibutio* [Florence, 1932], pp. 359 f.) and *passim* in the *apparatus criticus*. The note cited refers to *De Tyranno*, cap. V § 4 (justification of Dante's condemnation of Brutus and Cassius, in *Inferno* XXXIV). The familiarity of the writer of the marginalia with the atmosphere of Florentine republicanism is evident from the following comment he makes (relating to *De Tyranno*, cap. IV, § 17): "Nichil de peste rei publice per Imperatores advecta dicis; quales fuerunt G. Calligula Nero et alii, nichil de ruina Imperii romani, quod ante Imperatores duraverat annos CCCCLX vel circa et cito finitum sub Imperatoribus." This note may possibly point to a knowledge of Bruni's *Historiae Florentini Populi*, which in the same connection gives the figure of 465 years (ed. Santini, p. 22), while the corresponding figure in Ptolemy of Lucca's *De Regimine Principum* (lib II, cap. 9) had been 444. For the role of Porcari as a mouthpiece of the Florentine civic outlook although he was a Roman, see *Crisis*, chapter 18, note 54.

<sup>12</sup> For the date of Enea's *De Viris Illustribus* (1440-1450), see the "Cronologia delle opere" in G. Paparelli, *Enea Silvio Piccolomini: Pio II* (Bari, 1950), p. 363; for that of Fazio's *De Viris Illustribus*, see Rossi, *Il Quattrocento*, p. 190, who dates 1456, and J. Schlosser, *Die Kunstdliteratur* (Vienna, 1924), pp. 95, 97, who gives, as reliable *termini a quo* and *ad quem*, the years 1453 and 1457.

<sup>13</sup> Bartolomeo Fazio, *De viris illustribus*, ed. L. Mehus (Florence, 1745). An instructive parallel is found in a Florentine manuscript of Gregory the Great's *Dialogi*, to which attention was drawn by Wattenbach many years ago. The scribe's subscription runs: "Explicit liber Dialogorum, quem scribi fecit frater Franciscus de Bardis ordinis Minorum 1423." (See W.

leaves little doubt that the latter used a manuscript of the one-dialogue version. For Enea Silvio's reading is *De Utilitate Disputationis*.<sup>14</sup> Whether he took the wording from a manuscript in his possession or phrased it himself, it must have been formulated by some one who knew the course of the conversations to the end of the first dialogue only, but was not acquainted with the surprising turn in the second dialogue. For despite the fact that the later portions of the first dialogue are devoted already to the controversy about Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, this controversy is merely an episode in the first dialogue whose opening discussion seems to indicate that the question of the "usefulness of disputations" is to be the leitmotiv of the debate. But a reading of both dialogues tips the scales so decidedly in favor of the Dante-Petrarch problem that it is almost inconceivable how anyone familiar with the later course of the debate could have volunteered to make "*de utilitate disputationis*" the title of the work.

In addition, the striking affinity between Enea's phrasing and the title given to the first dialogue when it was printed about ninety years later at Basel puts us on another important track. Since the Basel editor of 1536 was able to devise for his mutilated text a title kindred to, though not identical with, that used by Enea ("*Libellus de disputationum exercitationisque studiorum usu*" as against "*De utilitate disputationis*"),<sup>15</sup> he may be suspected of having known a manuscript of the type consulted by Enea. Now one needs only consider the problem in terms of geography and locality to realize that Enea and the Basel editor, despite their

---

Wattenbach, *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde*, VIII [1883], 338.) Here, too, the corruption has sprung from a situation of incertitude: the original title of Gregory's "Dialogi" had been replaced in many medieval copies and catalogues by the singular "Dialogus" (see P. Lehmann, "Mittelalterliche Buchertitel," *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl.* [1948], Heft 4, p. 59 f.), and "Liber Dialogorum" evidently emerged as a bastard from these two versions.

<sup>14</sup> ". . . scripsit de temporibus suis, de re militari, de utilitate disputationis, de gestis Gothorum . . ." ; *De Viris Illustribus*, in "Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart" (Stuttgart, 1842), p. 23.

<sup>15</sup> See, for the Basel edition of 1536, notes 3, 4 above.



distance in time, were in all probability drawing, if not on the same manuscript, then on derivations from the same parent. For when Enea prepared his *De Viris Illustribus*, he had been away from Italy for a long time, separated from the manuscript material circulating on the Peninsula. Before writing his work while a secretary in the imperial Chancery (1442-1447) and Bishop of Trent (1447-1451), he had lived in Basel during the whole earlier period of the Basel Council.<sup>16</sup> Among the secretaries at the Basel Council, therefore, there must have been circulating a copy of the one-dialogue version, descendants of which continued to be preserved on the northern slope of the Alps down to the early period of printing when these manuscripts together with the one-dialogue copy taken north by Hartmann Schedel from Padua, determined the unhappy later fortunes of Bruni's youthful work.

But why did a manuscript containing the first dialogue alone appear in Basel, meeting place of scholars, at a time when numerous manuscripts of the complete work were known and available throughout Italy? One of the few preserved manuscripts of the one-dialogue version allows us to answer this question with precision. This copy is part of the manuscript no. 1111 of the Bibliothèque municipale de Reims, copied for Cardinal Guillaume Fillastre in 1416 during the Council at Constance where a group of Italian humanist secretaries were assembled.<sup>17</sup> The copy made at Fillastre's request is remarkable not only for its neglect of the second dialogue, but also because of the obvious kinship of its title to later titles of the one-dialogue version. Fillastre's manuscript is superscribed "*Incipit elegantissimus dyalogus domini Leonardi Aretini, in quo hortatur viros studiosos ad exercitium*

<sup>16</sup> For Enea's stay in Basel and his relations to the imperial Chancery, compare Th. Buyken, *Enea Silvio Piccolomini. Sein Leben und Werden bis zum Episkopat* (Bonn, 1931), pp. 21-54.

<sup>17</sup> See *Catalogue Général des MSS. des Bibliothèques Publiques de France, Départements*, tom. 39 I (1904), p. 302. The text of the *Dialogus*, contained on fol. 118-130 of the manuscript, has been available in microfilm. For a survey of the manuscripts executed at Cardinal Fillastre's order, and of his literary interests, see P. Lehmann, "Konstanz und Basel als Büchermärkte während der grossen Kirchenversammlungen," in Lehmann's *Erforschung des Mittelalters* (Leipzig, 1941), pp. 266-269.

*disputandi*"; and after the preface there follows a second title line showing the following concise form of the title: "*Leonardi Aretini de utilitate disputandi dyalogus*." Here, then, we already find every one of the elements later used either by Enea or by the Basel editor in their respective titles. When in addition it is recalled that the imperial Chancery, which Enea joined in 1442, had during the two Councils been located for some time at Constance and Basel, we can hardly avoid the conclusion that all these manuscripts must be derived, directly or indirectly, from one common source. Even the manuscript found by Schedel in the orbit of the Paduan University with its many international contacts might conceivably have been brought there from Constance or Basel.

But can we be sure that our attempt to retrace the fortunes of the *Dialogi*, which brought us to the Council of Constance about 1416, has not led us to a point where we must conclude that mutilation of some complete text was responsible for the beginning of the lineage of one-dialogue manuscripts? To a casual observer it might appear that a non-Italian like Fillastre, who can be assumed to have been more interested in the introductory debate on the usefulness of "disputations" than in the subsequent Florentine discussion and rehabilitation of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, may have been satisfied with having only the first half of the work copied for himself. But this suspicion is dispelled by other observations.

One of them concerns the peculiar form of the title line in the Fillastre manuscript. As we observed, it is almost impossible that a title such as exhortation "*ad exercitium disputandi*" could ever have headed any manuscript containing both dialogues. It follows that if the one-dialogue version were an abridgment made for Cardinal Fillastre, the title form of his manuscript would be the work of his scribe. Now we have seen that essentially the same wording of the title appears in several later manuscripts. Unless these were direct or indirect copies of the Fillastre transcript, all of them, including Fillastre's copy, must have had a common source. The Fillastre transcript was certainly not made for circulation among the humanists at the Council; Cod. Reims 1111,

of which it is a part, was a gift of the Cardinal to the Reims Cathedral Library, was sent there on completion, and cannot have been the cause for the appearance of the "*exercitium* (or, *utilitas*) *disputationis*" titles of later manuscripts in the Constance and Basel region.<sup>18</sup> Accordingly, we may be sure that Fillastre's scribe took his title from a source used also by the parents of the other one-dialogue manuscripts. This, in turn, means that the manuscript from which they all took their title form already belonged to the one-dialogue type.

Of this one-dialogue manuscript in Constance, one further descendant has come down to us in a fragment of Bruni's work, preserved as a part of the Vatican manuscript Cod. Lat. 1883 under the title "*Incipit dialogus domini Leonardi Aretini, Ortantis viros studiosos ad exercitium disputandi.*" This fragment, it is true, contains merely a brief portion of the text, broken off after the scribe had written the preface and a few pages of the first dialogue; this may be the reason why it failed to attract the attention of Bruni students. But the fragment suffices to establish with certainty that, like the Fillastre copy, it has all the characteristic features

<sup>18</sup> Cod. Reims 1111 belongs to a group of manuscripts distinguished by plentiful inscriptions of the scribes, of Fillastre himself, and of the librarians of the Reims library, indicating that the respective copies had been ordered as gifts from the Cardinal to the Reims Cathedral library, and that they had been sent there from Constance. That they were sent to their destination without delay is proved by the shortness of time between the dates of their completion and the dates, given in the notes, when they had been chained to their desks in Reims. Compare the following descriptions in *Catalogue Général*, tom. 39 I, pp. 302, 470 f., 483 f.:

Cod. Reims 1111, written in Constance "anno Domini M° CCCC° XVI°, apostolica Sede vacante," "catenatus [that is, incorporated into the Library of the Reims cathedral chapter] 25<sup>a</sup> novembris, anno 1416."

Cod. Reims 1321: Written in Constance "anno Domini M° CCCC° XVII° et concilii tercio," with an autographic note of Fillastre "Ego Guillelmus, cardinalis Sancti Marci, olim decanus Remensis, hunc librum dono librerie ecclesie Remensis, quem pro ea scribi feci. Scriptum manu propria Constance, in concilio generali, anno Domini millesimo CCCXVII, die prima novembris"; "catenatus [that is, in Reims] 12<sup>a</sup> aprilis anno 1418."

Cod. Reims 1338: Written in Constance "anno Domini M° CCCC° XVI°, apostolica Sede vacante." The Reims Library note is: "catenatus 25<sup>a</sup> novembris anno 1416."

of manuscripts limited to the *Prooemium* and the *Dialogus I*; that it follows the same master text as Fillastre's copy, without being directly or indirectly dependent on the Fillastre transcript; and that it was written in Constance, at the time of the Council, for the Italian Cardinal Giordano Orsini.<sup>19</sup>

We can now state with confidence that we need not suspect the one-dialogue version of having originated as an abridgment made to fit the taste of a non-Italian reader. For the same version, with essentially the same title form, was at the same time and in the same place transcribed independently for an Italian Cardinal. This means that the accessible history of the one-dialogue version begins with the circulation at Constance of a one-dialogue manuscript to which two literary patrons, an Italian and a non-Italian, had recourse.

A puzzle remains: how could anybody have dared to offer for copying a one-dialogue manuscript in 1416, and why was it accepted as a model by two patrons who obviously were able and willing to look around for complete and reliable master texts, or by their literary advisers? The two-dialogue version of the *Dialogi* must have been well known among the humanist secretaries who had traveled from Italy to the seat of the Council in 1414-15. Besides, Bruni himself had been a member of the Italian colony at Constance during the winter 1414-15, and we know that at least two manuscripts of the two-dialogue type were available at the Council: the present Cod. Augiensis 131 of the Library of Karlsruhe, which was taken to Constance by some one who knew Bruni intimately, and later purchased by the Library of Reichenau Abbey; and the present Cod. Cracow 519, which must also have been in Constance during the Council, before it made its journey to Poland.<sup>20</sup> In such a situation, can we believe that an Italian

<sup>19</sup> All this is established below, in the Excursus, which follows, on "Cod. Vat. Lat. 1883, a One-Dialogue Manuscript of the *Dialogi* from the Council of Constance."

<sup>20</sup> For the manuscript of the Badische Landesbibliothek Karlsruhe, Cod. Augiensis 131, see A. Holder, *Die Reichenauer Handschriften*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1906), pp. 323-325. The scribe must have been in personal contact with Bruni, because he reproduces a poem, otherwise unknown,

visitor had carried across the Alps a manuscript of Bruni's work that did not contain the second dialogue?

There is a very simple answer to this question if we accept the hypothesis that the version which Bruni in 1401 completed and communicated to Vergerio consisted of the preface and the first dialogue only. For in that case, preservation of the dedication copy by Vergerio meant preservation of a source from which new manuscripts of the one-dialogue version could easily come, even long after the second dialogue had been included in whatever manuscripts were circulating among Bruni's friends in Florence. Wherever Vergerio in his later years was to show the dedication copy once sent by his famous friend, there was a chance that his manuscript was used for copying because it was looked upon as the authentic version.

Now we find that Vergerio was a curial secretary at the Council in Constance when the Cardinals Fillastre and Orsini chose a manuscript of the one-dialogue type for copying. Vergerio, as we know, after the end of Padua's independence in 1404 had found refuge at the Curia, and in 1414 he moved with the Curia of John XXIII to Constance, where he stayed until 1418 — except for the period from July 1415 to January 1417, when he accompanied Emperor Sigismund on his journey to France and England. By the time he left Constance, in May 1418, he had transferred to the imperial Chancery which during the session of the Council had been situated in that city.<sup>21</sup> If Vergerio had preserved Bruni's dedication copy, as we may expect him to have done, it seems highly probable that he took it with his belongings to Constance. It is also certain that at Constance Vergerio did not remain a

---

written by Bruni in his youth, and tells us about Bruni's personal opinion on this poem.

For the manuscript Cracow University Library 519, see section 3, note 11 below.

<sup>21</sup> Vergerio arrived at Constance as early as October 1414; see L. Smith, *Archivio Veneto*, ser. V, vol. IV (1928), p. 120. That he accompanied Sigismund on his entire journey to France, England, and the Low Countries, from July 1415 to January 1417, was not yet assumed by Smith, but has been maintained by F. Banfi, in *Corvina, Rassegna Italo-Ungherese*, N. S. vol. II (1940), *supplemento*, p. 5, and may be considered proved.

stranger to the two high clergymen who were eager to procure some recent products of humanistic literature. For Fillastre's *Diary* of the events at the Council shows detailed knowledge of Vergerio's role in an episode in which Vergerio as an official of the Curia took an active part.<sup>22</sup>

Against the background of these incontestable contacts it is not far-fetched, indeed, to think that, while Vergerio was showing around and, in keeping with the known habits of other Italian secretaries at the Council, was trying to use profitably the book treasures he had brought along with him, Fillastre and Orsini, or rather the middleman who made the first copy, followed the dedication manuscript of Bruni's work, presented as it was by the humanist to whom it was addressed; and that this copy, or its derivatives, also circulated at the imperial Chancery and reached Enea Silvio. Even though the descent from Vergerio's copy cannot be finally proven, the history of the manuscript tradition encourages the belief that the original form of Bruni's work was its one-dialogue version.

#### Excursus

##### COD. VAT. LAT. 1883, A ONE-DIALOGUE MANUSCRIPT OF THE *DIALOGI* FROM THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE

In our attempt to trace the history of the one-dialogue version of Bruni's *Dialogi* we were eventually led back to the Council of Constance. There, a transcript limited to the *Prooemium* and *Dialogus I* was produced as early as 1416 at the commission of the Cardinal Guillaume Fillastre: the manuscript no. 1111 of the Bibliothèque de Reims. An opinion on the parentage of this Reims manuscript and on the possible circulation of the one-dialogue version at Constance, depends on the discovery of further traces of one-dialogue manuscripts in the humanistic circles at the Council. Now such a trace is found in the folios 12<sup>v</sup>-15<sup>v</sup> of the *Codex miscell. Vat. Lat.* 1883.

This assertion demands a careful demonstration. For the few pages from *Dialogus I* contained in the Vatican manuscript are but a portion of the text of the dialogue;<sup>1</sup> only an analysis of the whole manuscript

<sup>22</sup> The passage was published by H. Finke, in his *Forschungen und Quellen zur Geschichte des Konstanzer Konzils* (Paderborn, 1889), p. 202, and from there reprinted by Smith, *Archivio Veneto*, pp. 121-122.

<sup>1</sup> The copy stops with the words "inventus sit qui aliquam praestanciam in his rebus"; ed. Klette p. 53, line 17, ed. Garin p. 60, line 10.

\* See Card. Giovanni Mercati, *Codici Latini Pico Grimani Pio e di Altra Biblioteca Ignota . . . con una Digressione per la Storia dei Codici di S. Pietro in Vaticano*, in the series "Studi e Testi," vol. 75 (1938), pp. 155, 165, for the descent of Cod. Vat. Lat. 1883 from the collection of Cardinal Giordano Orsini, and for the history of the manuscript before its incorporation in the Vatican Library.

One point in this history needs comment—our inability to locate the manuscript in the two oldest library catalogues (of 1434 and 1483/84) in which manuscripts from Giordano Orsini's collection are listed. One is the inventory included in Orsini's last will of July 26, 1434, which presents a cursory survey of his library. To judge from the only available edition, in F. G. Cancellieri, *De Secretariis Veteris Basilicae Vaticanae*, vol. II (Romae, 1786), pp. 906–914, which is neither complete nor entirely reliable as Mercati (p. 164, n. 3) has pointed out, two items might be considered for possible identification with our manuscript: a volume described as "Plutarcus in vitam Titi quintii [Flaminii] et quibusdam aliis [sic]" (p. 909), and another described as "Plutarcus in quasdam vitas" (p. 910). The latter entry is too vague to allow any conclusions. If the first should indicate our manuscript, the mention of the *Vita Flaminii* (instead of the *Vita Demosthenis* with which the manuscript today begins) might arouse the suspicion that the part preceding the *Vita Flaminii*, including the *Dialogus I* fragment, was only later bound together with the second half of the manuscript. But if so, the opening section must also have come from Orsini's collection; because its first item, the *Vita Demosthenis*, shows the familiar painted coat of arms of the Cardinal.

More puzzling is the observation that in 1483/84, in a catalogue of the Library of the Basilica di S. Pietro where our manuscript is listed (as nr. CCXXXIX; see Mercati, *Codici Latini*, pp. 158, 168), the *Dialogus I* fragment is missing in the list of the contents. Since the manuscript was written by four different scribes, one of whom worked only on the *Dialogus I* fragment (*Codices Vaticani Latini*, tom. III, ed. Nogara, p. 336), the question suggests itself whether the *Dialogus I* fragment might not have been inserted in the manuscript later, in which case the inserted part may not have come from Orsini's library. Fortunately, we can remove this suspicion by another observation. A second text forming part of the manuscript today but omitted in the catalogue description of 1483/84, is the translation of Aelius Aristides' *Oration on Dionysus* made by Cencio de' Rustici. In this second case of omission, the neglected item is not a text written by a separate hand and, therefore, exposed to the suspicion of being a subsequent addition, but is a product of the same scribe who also wrote the preceding *Historiae adversus Paganos* by Orosius, an item listed in the 1483/84 description. When we now compare the two texts omitted and the items listed in the catalogue, we see that the two absent pieces are both modern publications of an exclusively humanistic appeal, while the manuscript is composed otherwise of classical and medieval writings of old standing—works of incomparably greater interest to a library like that of the Basilica of S. Pietro. Once this difference has been considered, our inability to find the *Dialogus I* fragment listed will no longer cause much surprise.

the bulk of his literary possessions until he had returned to Italy,<sup>5</sup> he, like Fillastre, had stayed in Constance for several years—from the autumn of 1414 to the spring of 1418<sup>6</sup>—and we have at least one testimony of his bibliophile interests at that early date. In March 1416, Duke John of Burgundy offered him a manuscript of Livy as a gift, an offer that would hardly have been made if the Cardinal had not been known even at that time for his humanistic interests. This Livy volume Orsini later took to Rome, and eventually it formed part of his bequest to the Basilica di S. Pietro.<sup>7</sup> As to the other manuscripts in the Cardinal's gift, including the Cod. Vat. Lat. 1883, we have no information that any of them derived from the Constance period. But the material included in the Cod. Vat. Lat. 1883 turns out on closer examination to be such as could only have been gathered at Constance, so that this item of Orsini's library must have had a history parallel to that of the Burgundian Livy manuscript.

The Cod. Vat. Lat. 1883 contains several classical works, and four pieces from the pens of humanistic authors. Among the first group we find two very rare items, Aethicus' *Cosmographia* and the so-called *Itinerarium Provinciarum Antonini Augusti*. Yet despite their rarity, copies of both of these works were made also for Cardinal Fillastre at Constance in 1417; they are found in the present Reims manuscript no. 1321.<sup>8</sup> Of the four humanistic items, two are works which had been composed shortly before the Constance Council: Bruni's translation of Plutarch's *Vita Demosthenis*, done in 1412,<sup>9</sup> and Guarino's translation of Plutarch's *Vita T. Quinctii Flamini*, written about 1411.<sup>10</sup> These two translations are also found among the Fillastre manuscripts, in the Reims manuscript no. 1338 which was copied for Fillastre at Constance in 1416.<sup>11</sup> The third humanistic item in the Cod. Vat. Lat. 1883 belongs to the Constance period itself. It is a translation of an *Oration on Dionysus* by Aelius Aristides, made by the secretary Cencio de' Rustici during his sojourn at Constance. This short work of Cencio's has been handed down to us in only one other manuscript which also comes from Constance.<sup>12</sup> Thus this translation can hardly have been known at that time beyond the Constance circle. When we add that the fourth item is our fragment of Bruni's *Dialogus*

<sup>5</sup> Koenig, *Kardinal Giordano Orsini*, p. 84.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 30, 38.

<sup>7</sup> See the identification of the manuscript by Koenig, *ibid.*, pp. 32 f., 84 f.

<sup>8</sup> See for the notes in Cod. Reims 1321, Chapter VI, section 2, note 18.

<sup>9</sup> Bruni, *Schriften*, p. 163.

<sup>10</sup> *Epistolario di Guarino Veronese*, ed. R. Sabbadini, vol. I (1915), pp. 17 f.

<sup>11</sup> See for the notes in Cod. Reims 1338, Chapter VI, section 2, note 18.

<sup>12</sup> Namely, Cod. Laur. 90 sup. 42; compare A. M. Bandini, *Catal. codd.*



I, which, as we have shown, conforms in its title almost literally with the copy made for Fillastre at Constance in 1416, no one will hesitate to attribute the composition of the Cod. Vat. Lat. 1883 to Constance, and to the time of the Constance Council.

One question only remains open for discussion. Given the fact that so many of the items contained in Orsini's collection appear also among Fillastre's Constance manuscripts, is it not possible that the Orsini texts were copied from the Fillastre texts, or vice versa? In the case of the two manuscripts of Bruni's *Dialogus I*, any such direct dependence would, of course, mean derivation of the Orsini text from the Fillastre text, since Orsini's fragment cannot possibly have served as a basis for Fillastre's finished text. The close personal relationship between the two cardinals who for several years worked side by side on the boards and in the sessions of the Council, and who after 1418 were sent to France together as papal envoys,<sup>13</sup> would certainly have permitted mutual loans of manuscripts for copying on the spot. On the other hand, the same prolonged association gave the two cardinals just as much of a chance to have their texts copied independently from the same model.

That this last alternative is the correct one can be shown in several ways, and has already been suggested by some facts established previously. The manuscripts of Fillastre, as we have seen, were not kept in Constance for any length of time after their completion, but were forwarded to Reims without delay.<sup>14</sup> As to Cardinal Orsini, our analysis of the contents of Cod. Vat. Lat. 1883 has made it clear that he knew how to hunt up recent humanistic products (like Cencio de' Rustici's translation) to which there is no counterpart in Fillastre's manuscripts. Thus, it is very unlikely that Orsini should have mustered his collection by taking copies of Fillastre's manuscripts before these were sent off to Reims.

A comparison of the two texts bears out our conclusion. Collation of the preface yields the result that, despite a very close affinity of the two manuscripts, Fillastre's shows some mistakes and omissions which no copyist could possibly have changed back to the common version found in the Orsini manuscript.<sup>15</sup>

*Lat. Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*, vol. III (1776), col. 574. L. Bertalot, "Cincius Romanus und seine Briefe," *Quellen und Forschungen aus ital. Archiven*, XXI (1929-1930), p. 210, lists no manuscripts but the Laurentianus and Cod. Vat. Lat. 1883. Earlier students of Cencio's translation (Voigt, A. Wilmanns, and M. Lehnerdt), who worked before the publication of the third volume of the catalogue of the *Codices Vaticani Latini* by Nogara, knew only the Laurentianus.

<sup>13</sup> Koenig, *Kardinal Giordano Orsini*, pp. 34 f., 37 ff.

<sup>14</sup> See above pp. 136 f.

While we can thus state as certain that the Orsini manuscript cannot have been copied from that of Fillastre, the exact relationship of the two texts is best illustrated by the divergence of their readings in one case where the cause for their variance is obvious. Both manuscripts at that point substitute a longer word for the preposition *a* of the regular version,<sup>16</sup> but whereas the Fillastre text here reads *aliqua*, Orsini's scribe has copied the abbreviation *ai*<sup>ca</sup>, without spelling it out. Indubitably, this unusual abbreviation had been encountered by both scribes, but only the one employed by Fillastre knew how to decipher it.<sup>17</sup> It follows that both copyists used one and the same model.

The service rendered by the Orsini fragment, then, is that it proves that the manuscript ordered at Constance for the Cathedral library of Reims was not an abbreviation made at Fillastre's request, it was the reproduction of a one-dialogue version, circulated at the Council, which is preserved to us in two surviving texts.

### 3. THE TITLE OF THE *DIALOGI*

Two puzzling questions regarding the title of the work must be answered by the student of Bruni's *Dialogi*. Was the title, "The

<sup>16</sup> The following evidence points to a common descent of the two manuscripts. Both differ alike from all other known manuscripts in these places of the preface: Klette, p. 40, line 16 (Garin 44, 25), their common reading is *nunc*, as against *tunc* in all other copies; p. 40, line 17 (Garin 44, 26), *dum tu*, as against *tu dum*; p. 41, line 1 (Garin 44, 29), both read *scio* as against *scis* in all other manuscripts; and p. 41, line 4 (Garin 44, 32), they alone have *disputationem in hoc libro illam*, as against the regular reading *disputationem illam in hoc libro*.

But this affinity must not be interpreted as dependence of Orsini's manuscript on that of Fillastre, for the following reasons. First, concerning the title line, if Orsini's scribe had copied the Fillastre text, it would seem unlikely that he should have returned from Fillastre's *Elegantissimus dialogus* to the standard reading *dialogus*. Second, there are in the preface three conclusive indications. While the Fillastre text, p. 39, line 13 (Garin 44, 10), differing from all other manuscripts, has *tamen*, the Orsini reading is the regular *tum*. Similarly, p. 40, line 12 (Garin 44, 21), the Fillastre text alone has *ac*, while the Orsini scribe, together with the rest of the manuscripts, writes *atque*. Finally, p. 40, line 3 (Garin 44, 14), the Orsini copy, in accordance with the other manuscripts, includes the word *una*, which is omitted in the Fillastre text.

<sup>18</sup> As reproduced in Klette, p. 40, line 13; Garin, p. 44, line 22.

<sup>17</sup> For *ai*<sup>ca</sup> = *alica* = *aliqua*, see A. Cappelli, *Dizionario di Abbreviature Latine ed Italiane* (2nd ed., Milan, 1912), p. 12.

Dialogues," (*Dialogi*), which has been widely used by modern scholars, a later formulation added to the text? If so, can we either identify the original form of the title or interpret the amazing diversity in the superscriptions of all the early manuscripts as meaning that Bruni's work had been given to the reading public without an author's title? Unless we have a right to answer these questions affirmatively, we should find the road blocked to any theory implying that the first dialogue of a work called *Dialogi* was written separately and dedicated to a friend at a time when the second dialogue was not yet in existence.

At first glance the title form of *Dialogorum Libri Duo* may seem to be derived from very early and reliable sources. With the sole exception of Poggio, who in the biographical sketch he wrote at Bruni's death speaks of a *Dialogus* composed of two "books,"<sup>1</sup> all Florentine biographers know the work (with only slight variations) as "The Two Books of Dialogues." Giannozzo Manetti in his official funeral oration for Bruni in 1444 states that Bruni had composed "*Explanationum duos in Oeconomicorum Aristotelis Libros, Dialogorum totidem.*"<sup>2</sup> In the important anonymous biography and eulogy of Bruni in the Laurenziana manuscript plut. 90 sup. cod. 5, written at Bruni's death by a citizen closely connected with him in the Florentine Chancery, Bruni is said to have written "*Dialogorum libros duos.*" The same title form is reproduced by the well-informed chronicler Sozomeno di Pistoia, who was in intimate contact with the Florentine circle of humanists. And a generation later, Vespasiano da Bisticci, the cicerone of the Florentine group, speaks of Bruni's "*Dialogi ad Petrum Histrium.*"<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The special circumstances under which Poggio composed his obituary will be explained later; see p. 150.

<sup>2</sup> See Manetti, *Oratio Funebris* on Bruni, in Mehus' edit. of Bruni's *Epistolae*, vol. I, p. CII.

<sup>3</sup> *Laudatio Leonardi historici et oratoris*, in Cod. Laur. Plut. 90 sup. c. 5: "Scripsit . . . dialogorum libros duos" (ed. E. Santini in his *Bruni e i suoi* "Hist. Flor. Pop." [see Chapter IV, section 2 Excursus, note 8], p. 152). Sozomeno di Pistoia, in the catalogue of Bruni's works inserted in his *Chronicon Universale*: "Dialogorum lib. II" ("Rer. Ital. Script.," n. ser.

But now we discover that the practical usage in the manuscripts is the very opposite of what these biographers would lead us to expect. While the singular "*Dialogus*" (or sometimes "*Liber*") is found in a large number of texts,<sup>4</sup> manuscripts introducing the work as "*Dialogi*" or "*Dialogorum Libri Duo*" are rare. We cannot draw up statistics, it is true, since the manuscripts of Bruni's work have not yet been systematically collected; but among the copies discussed in publications or otherwise known to this writer there seem to be not more than three or four using the plural "*Dialogi*." These manuscripts are of comparatively late origin (mid-Quattrocento or later);<sup>5</sup> and the most interesting among

tom. XVI part I, p. 38). Vespasiano da Bisticci, in his *Vite*. "Dialogi ad Petrum Histrium" (*Vite di Uomini Illustri*, ed. Frati, vol. II, p. 32).

<sup>4</sup> Manuscripts, containing the first dialogue alone or both dialogues, which show the title form "dialogus":

1) One-dialogue manuscripts: Cod. Reims 1111 (see Chapter VI, section 2, notes 17, 18); Cod. Vat. Lat. 1883 (see the preceding Excursus); Cod. Monac. 350 (see Chapter VI, section 2, note 6); Hermann Schedel's transcript of 1472/85 (see *ibid.*).

2) Two-dialogue manuscripts: Cod. Vat. Pal. Lat. 1598 (see note 6 below), Cod. Laur. Gadd. 90 sup. 60 ("Leonardi Aretini Dialogus incipit ad Petrum P. Histrium," according to Klette's edition, p. 39); Cod. Vat. Chig. J VI 215 ("Leonardi Aretini Dialogus ad Petrum Histrium," according to Worke's edition, p. 7); Cod. Berolinensis Lat. 4° 272 ("Leonardi Aretini Dialogo [*sic*] ad Petrum Istrium Liber Primus Incipit," according to Klette's edition, p. 39); Cod. Marcianus Lat. cl. VI no. 134 (see note 11 below), Cod. Palat. (Vienna) 229 (see *ibid.*); Cod. Cracow Univ. Lib. no. 519 (see *ibid.*); Cod. Augiensis 131 (see Chapter VI, section 2, note 20), of about 1410, the oldest manuscript of the dialogues, so far known. To be sure, Aug. 131 has no formal title (the superscription runs merely "Leonardi aretini ad Petrum hystrum"; see Klette's edition, p. 39, and Holder, *Reichenauer Handschriften*, I, 325), but between the dedication letter and the first dialogue there is a subtitle, "Incipit Dialogus Leonardi Aretini" (fol. 77v); the first dialogue ends "Explicit Primus liber Dialogi Leonardi aretini ad Petrum hystrum" (fol. 86r), and the second begins "Leonardi aretini ad Petrum hystrum liber Secundus" (fol. 86v. Quotations are from photo-stats owed to the great helpfulness of Museumsdirektor Dr. Kurt Martin, Karlsruhe).

<sup>5</sup> On Ms. Vat. Ottob. Lat. 1901 see Bruni, *Schriften*, pp. 231, 5, 42, 81.

On Ms. Vat. Ottob. Lat. 856, Dr. Augusto Campana and Prof. Luisa Banti kindly answered an inquiry in the following way: "Ottob. Lat. 856, saec. XV med., membr. There are two mss. bound together: The first contains (ff. 2r-18r) the Dialogi ad Petrum Histrium. Fol. 2r.: Leonardi aretini dialogorum liber primus. . . . Fol. 13r.: Leonardi aretini ad petrum

them, the copy from Giannozzo Manetti's library, written not long before Manetti delivered his funeral oration, shows a transition from the title "*Dialogus*" to that of "*Dialogi*." The superscription of the first dialogue, in this copy, still reads "*Leonardi arretini dyalogus ad Petrum Hystrum. Incipit liber primus*," and only at the head of the second dialogue do we find the transformed version "*Dialogorum Leonardi liber secundus incipit*."<sup>6</sup>

histrum, liber secundus. . . . Fol. 18r.: Leonardi arretini dialogorum ad petrum histrum. Liber secundus explicit feliciter. This ms. was the cod. 42 human. of Card. Sirleto (cf. Mercati, *Studi e Testi* 75, p. 256, n. 179). There follows a second ms. written by a different hand and of different dimensions (ff. 19-54); it contains the letter of Pius II to Mahomet II."

Ms. Urb. Lat. 1164, the third of the manuscripts with the title of "*Dialogi*," is a copy from Vat. Palat. 1598 (on the latter manuscript see the following note) and, consequently need not be counted in a statistics of the title forms in addition to the Palatinus. (For this derivation see Bruni, *Schriften*, p. 82, concerning the textual relationship of Bruni's *De Interpretatione Recta* in the two manuscripts, and Bertalot's assent in *Archivum Romanicum*, XV [1931], 291).

It should be noted that Ms. Laur. LII c. 3 in Florence does not belong in this group, although A. M. Bandini, *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*, vol. II (Florence, 1775), col. 546, describes the manuscript as "*Leonardi Arretini Dialogorum Libri duo ad Petrum Histrum*," and although Kirner (according to the introduction to his edition, p. X) chose as the title for his edition the form "*Dialogi ad Petrum Histrum*" precisely for the reason that "thus, indeed, we find it in cod. Laur. LII.3" ("così infatti troviamo nel cod. Laur. LII.3"). The truth is that the superscription (fol. 58r) merely runs "*Leonardi Arretini ad Petrum Histrum* [not 'Istrum,' as would appear from Klette's edition, p. 39] *Liber I*," according to a photostat of this page in the writer's possession; that is, any reference to "*Dialogi*" or "*Dialogus*" is lacking in the title. According to information received from Prof. Th. E. Mommsen, who had the kindness to examine the manuscript for the writer, these words actually occur nowhere, except in the much younger index of the volume (possibly XVIIth or XVIIIth century) where the entry runs "*Ad Petrum Histrum Dialogus in libro [sic] duos partitus*."

<sup>6</sup> Ms. Vat. Pal. 1598, fol. 1r and 11r. For the content of this manuscript see the description in Bruni, *Schriften*, p. 231. Since the first three texts in the volume — Bruni's *Dialogi*, *De Militia*, *De Laudibus Florentinae Urbis* — were copied in 1439, according to a note at the end of *De Laudibus*, and since headings and sub-headings of these three works were inserted by another hand, the title lines of the two dialogues, as discussed above, may have been written after 1439, possibly not until the time of Bruni's death when Manetti, the owner, composed his funeral oration on Bruni, or even later. The fact that titles and texts of the first three works were

There can be no doubt, therefore, that the title "*Dialogorum Libri II*" was not coined before the mid-century. The only puzzling aspect of the story is that such a late change was then so commonly accepted that henceforth every Florentine writer, as well as a number of Florentine manuscripts, spoke of the "*Dialogi*." But there is a simple explanation for the sudden emergence of a new title form. The various biographers and eulogists of the dead humanist-chancellor quite evidently used, and partly reproduced, a bibliographical list of Bruni's works that had then been drawn up in the Florentine circle. A complete copy of this list has been preserved in the Cod. Laur. Cisterc. Amiat. IV., and a part of it is also found, in Italian translation, in a *Priorista* contained in the Cod. Ricc. 1136.<sup>7</sup> Now in this catalogue of Bruni's writings every title is followed by a note indicating the number of the constituent "books" (*libri*). These statistical notations are the focus of interest of the compilation, since the author of the list in the end sums up how many "books" were published altogether by Bruni in his various works, and also how many "books" he had translated from the Greek. The author of the statistics — he may have been Manetti himself — quite naturally paid attention to the fact that two dialogues, that is, two units to be counted separately, were combined in Bruni's *opusculum*; and so we understand why he preferred, or most probably coined, the title "*Dialogorum Libri II*."

---

written by different hands (that means, that the titles were written subsequently to the texts) has been established with certainty from photostats and microfilms available to the writer. If any doubt should remain (the two scripts are not easily differentiated), it would be resolved by an examination of fol. 33r, where, at the end of *De Militia*, a subscription line of the scribe of the text ("Leonardus Arretinus edidit Florentie XVIII Kal. Januarum M° CCCC° XXI°") is available for comparison with the entries of the scribe of the titles, who on the same page wrote the superscription of the *Laudatio* ("Leonardi arretini de Laudibus florentine urbis. Incipit feliciter"). The two lines are indubitably by different hands.

<sup>7</sup>The contemporary catalogue of Bruni's works in Cod. Laur. Cist. Amiat. IV is published in A. M. Bandini's *Bibliotheca Leopoldina Laurentiana . . . Catalogus*, vol. I (Florence, 1791), col. 694-695. The information about Cod. Ricc. 1136 is owed to the courtesy of Dr. Werner Cohn who, at this writer's request, examined the manuscript.

As a consequence, we must not allow ourselves to be deceived by the unanimity of our Florentine witnesses ever since the time of Bruni's death: all their testimonies are ultimately derived from one source of late origin.

A perilous stumbling block in the way of our theory has thus been removed. The title form of Bruni's work does not veto the hypothesis that initially it consisted of one "*dialogus*" only.

We are now also in a position to see the cause of Poggio's lone deviation. He was the only one of Bruni's obituarists who can be thought not to have had access to the contemporaneous catalogue of Bruni's works, since he was papal secretary at the Curia in 1444. Living in Rome, Poggio was compelled to rely on his own memory, and on what knowledge he had gathered through years of intimate contacts with Bruni. His reference to the *Dialogus* composed of two "books" (*primus liber* and *secundus liber*), therefore, compels attention; and since his terminology is confirmed by the usage of various manuscripts, among which must also have been the parent of Manetti's copy, we cannot doubt that Poggio's form of the title was the one usually read in Florentine circles before the change to *Dialogi* occurred at the time of Bruni's death.<sup>8</sup>

But must we assume that Poggio's wording had been a title coined by Bruni himself? If it had been used always and everywhere, and if it had been considered an acceptable form of title, why should the obituarists have altered it, and why was their alteration generally accepted?

In the first place, the adoption of the plural "*Dialogi*" by the contemporaries seems to suggest that to them it appeared odd to use the term "*Dialogus*" to connote two conversations held at different times, in different places, and among groups that were not entirely identical. Whoever knew the *Dialogi* of Seneca, or the *Dialogi* by Gregory the Great, or remembered the title of

<sup>8</sup> Poggio, *Oratio Funebris* on Bruni, in Mehus' edition of Bruni's *Epistolae*, vol. I, pp. CXXII f. For the date of Poggio's *Oratio* — Rome, June/July 1444 — see Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung*, vol. I<sup>8</sup>, p. 312. For manuscripts using the title form "dialogus" and calling the two successive conversations two "libri," see pp. 147 f. above.

Cicero's *Tusculanarum Disputationum Libri Quinque*, was indeed bound to have his classical taste offended by such a use of *Dialogus*. Manetti, or a contemporary humanistic critic, (so one may reconstruct what eventually happened), invented a mutation which made the title correspond to logic and to classical precedent. The puzzle is why Bruni himself should have chanced upon a name so little in harmony with either. His negligence — if such indeed there was — is all the more surprising since in the same early period of his life he did not allow his *Laudatio* to be published before its title had been phrased with care.<sup>9</sup> And in later years, we find, he was adapting his titles to the respective numbers of "books" so consistently and with such care that full reliance can be placed on the indications in his titles.<sup>10</sup> Must not all this arouse the suspicion that Bruni was not entirely free in his choice of title for the two dialogues when both went before the reading public?

There are other irregular features in the history of our title. It is no more than half true to say that, while the use of "*Dialogi*" is rare and late, the earlier and more common usage is "*Dialogus*." For normally this term, when it occurs in the manuscripts, introduces a much longer title line, and we are bewildered to find that the elaborating phrases, which define the contents of the work more closely, are of the boldest variety. In three manuscripts, preserved in Venice, Vienna, and Cracow respectively, we find the title "*Dialogus Leonardi Aretini ad Petrum Paulum Justipolitanum in quo de modernis quibusdam scriptoribus in comparatione ad antiquos disputatur*." Though adequate as a statement of the chief contents, this résumé is obviously much too long for a regular title from the author's pen. Yet it occurs as early as 1416,

<sup>9</sup> See above pp. 73 (esp. note 8), 81. The circumstance that the formulation which Bruni then proposed, namely "*Laudatio*," did not finally prevail over "*De Laudibus*" which was preferred by copyists, biographers, and even Bruni himself (see above pp. 96 f.), does not alter the fact that Bruni was careful not to publish his work before a title had been found which at that time seemed to him satisfactory.

<sup>10</sup> For his reliability in an intricate case, see Chapter VII "The Genesis of Bruni's Annotated Latin Version of the (Pseudo-) Aristotelian *Economics*."



or even somewhat earlier.<sup>11</sup> Nor can the title form in another group of two-dialogue manuscripts be the author's own; in this group, the concept implied in the term "*Dialogus*" is rendered by "*Collatio Colucii et aliorum quorundam*," and the word "*Dialogus*" is replaced by "*Liber*," to which again is added a brief characterization of the contents that is entirely different from the one just cited: "*Leonardi Arctini liber qui est collatio Colucii et aliorum quorundam de preconio trium vatum florentinorum*" — as the exact title runs in a Florentine and in a Roman manuscript. That this inscription of the work, too, though very obviously not an author's title, was used even in Bruni's own days, is attested by a third manuscript of the group, transcribed in 1429–30.<sup>12</sup> There exists also a comparatively large group of manuscripts

<sup>11</sup> Cod. Marcianus Lat. cl. VI n. 134. (Here "in comparisonem;" see Klette's edition, p. 39). Cod. Vienna Pal. Lat. 229; cf. the description in *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der Illuminierten Handschriften in Oesterreich*, Neue Folge, Band VI, Teil I (Leipzig, 1930), p. 135. (Here "in quo" and "disputatur" are lacking, the title ends "ad antiquos Prohemium incipit".)

For Cod. Cracow Univ. Lib. no. 519, DD VIII 7, see W. Wislocki, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Universitatis Jagellonicae Cracoviensis. Katalog rękopisów Biblioteki Uniwersyteckiej Jagiellońskiej*, vol. I (Cracow, 1877), p. 163. (Here the title reads precisely as in the cod. Marcianus. The Cracow catalogue gives no *incipits* and *explicitis*; but since the *Dialogus* covers fol. 37 to 45, and the translation of Demosthenes' *De Ctesiphonte* by Bruni, immediately following, covers fol. 45 to 61, and since Demosthenes' oration in Latin translations contains about twice as many words as Bruni's two dialogues together, it may be taken for granted that the Cracow text is a manuscript containing both dialogues). The particular significance of the Cracow manuscript is that it proves the occurrence of the "*De Modernis*" title form at an early date. The first item of the Cracow manuscript, Cicero's *De inventione*, is followed by the corrector's subscription "Revidi totum istud opusculum et puto, textum esse correctum pro maiori parte. Hec feci a. 1414, 15 Novembris, tempore quo pontifex Iohannes XXIII erat apud Concilium Constancie. Dominicus de Bayardis de Firmo." This note, it is true, does not necessarily mean that the subsequent sections of the manuscript, including Bruni's *Dialogus*, were already in existence in November 1414. But since it may be assumed that some cleric or secretary took the volume from the Constance Council to Poland, the later parts of the manuscript can hardly be younger than 1416. Lehmann, *Erforschung des Mittelalters*, p. 265, also assumes origin of the entire manuscript at, or before, the Council. (Lehmann's note on Cracow manuscript "Cod. 569" actually refers to the manuscript no. 519 here discussed).

<sup>12</sup> Florence Bibl. Naz., cod. Conv. Soppr. (S. Marco) J I 31 (see Kirner's

lacking any title.<sup>13</sup> Under these circumstances it is understandable why the Genoese Bartolommeo Fazio around 1450, when writing his bio-bibliography of famous men, invented the citation "*Dialogorum Liber*",<sup>11</sup> only in Florence, at the middle of the century, "*Dialogorum Libri II*" was coming to be the received form, while elsewhere no quotable accepted wording could yet be ascertained.

Though it must be admitted that considerable variations of a title form are far from unusual in manuscripts of the fifteenth century, it is equally obvious that the situation revealed by our quotations is different from a more or less casual transformation of a common version. Evidently, long before humanists of Manetti's stamp ventured upon a classical solution for the naming of the work, many simple copyists had deemed it necessary to invent titles according to their own judgment. From the beginning readers may have looked upon the bare word "*Dialogus*" not as a title, but rather as a generic term to be completed by a specific description of the contents. This must also have been the

---

edition, p. XXIV); Cod. Vat. Regin. Lat. 1321 (see Wotke's edition, p. 7, and Bertalot, *Archivum Romanicum*, XV, 321). In the Cod. Regin., the words "eiusdemque urbis Florentie" are added at the end of the title.

In Cod. Chig. J. 214 the title is "Leonardi Aretini de Collatione Colucij et aliorum quorundam de preconio trium vatum florentinorum eiusdemque urbis florentine libellus." This manuscript includes, among other pieces, both dialogues, but the dedication letter to Vergerio is lacking. The manuscript is composed of two sections, the first dated 1429, the second [which contains Bruni's "De Collatione Colucij. . ."] 1430 [fol. 184r, at the end of the second part: "Explicit . . . MCCCC° XXX°"]; both parts have a mark of ownership of the marchese Leonardo Malespina, with the year 1430. The writer is indebted for this information to Dr. A. Campana and Prof. L. Banti.

<sup>13</sup> Cod. Laur. Gadd. 90 sup. 50 is without any superscription (according to Kirner's edition, p. XXV, and Klette's edition, p. 39); and so was the text originally in Cod. Ricc. 976 (written in the earlier part of the Quattrocento; see Chapter VI, section 2, note 7) before a later hand, probably in the seventeenth century (kind information by Prof. Kristeller), added the words "Dialogus ad Petrum de suorum temporum eruditione." In Cod. Basil. O.II.32, before insertion of an actual title by the editor of the Basel print of 1536 (see above, p. 130), the only superscription had been: "Leonardi Aretini Prohoemium ad suum Petrum." (See Klette's edition, p. 39).

<sup>14</sup> See Chapter VI, section 2, notes 12, 13.

feeling of the person who expanded the title of the one-dialogue version he circulated at the Constance Council, to read "*Dialogus domini Leonardi Aretini, in quo hortatur viros studiosos ad exercitium disputandi.*"<sup>15</sup> In view of this identical reaction of readers of all kinds it seems to be well-nigh impossible that Bruni himself should have considered the bare word "*Dialogus*" an appropriate title. When we consider further that the various quoted phrasings (including the heading of the one-dialogue manuscripts at Constance) all give the impression of copyists' comments rather than author's titles, while even the key word "*Dialogus*," from our oldest manuscript on, is often missing or else replaced by terms like "*Liber*" and "*Collatio*," it is difficult to escape the conclusion that Bruni's work was most probably published without any title whatever.

Given the usage of the time, and our knowledge of Bruni's care for the titles of his works from the *Laudatio* on, this is a surprising discovery. Evidently, it points to the presence of unusual circumstances in the publication of the *Dialogi*. Any hypothesis that would account for these circumstances must explain particularly why the first reader (or readers) chose to talk of the book as the "*Dialogus*" in the singular.<sup>16</sup>

Under these circumstances it is hard to see what other hypothesis could do justice to all the aspects of the situation except the assumption that Bruni's work, composed of the dedication letter and one "*dialogus*" alone, was in 1401 not published in the manner of a formal literary product, but sent to Vergerio without a title.

#### 4. THE DATE OF *DIALOGUS I*

One of the foundation stones on which our criticism of the *Dialogi* is based is the assumption that the date 1401, which we ascribe to the dedication and *Dialogus I*, is secure whatever indi-

<sup>15</sup> For this title see above pp. 135f., 137.

<sup>16</sup> Or as the "*Liber*" or as a work in which "*disputatur*," two terms (evidently taken from Bruni's preface) which, as we have seen, were often used instead of "*Dialogus*."

cations of a later origin have been found within the second dialogue.

The need for dating *Dialogus I* in the year 1401 springs from the fact that, according to the introductory words of the debate on the first day, the conversation took place on an Easter Sunday and further on one reads that Luigi Marsili "died seven years ago."<sup>1</sup> Since we know from indisputable evidence that Marsili died in August 1394,<sup>2</sup> the date to which the discussions are thus ascribed is Easter Sunday of 1401, which fell on April 3. This computation seems to be so cogent that it has never been seriously doubted.<sup>3</sup> But might we not suspect that both the date implied in the reference to Marsili's death, and the alleged meeting of the friends on an Easter Sunday, were fictitious literary devices? Since all chronological discussions of the *Dialogi* depend on the assurance that we need not harbor such suspicions, the question must be posed whether we can make certain by more reliable arguments that the dedication and the first dialogue were surely written in 1401.

<sup>1</sup> "Abhinc annis septem mortuus est." *Dialogi*, ed. Klette, p. 45; ed. Garin, p. 50.

<sup>2</sup> 1394, August 21, cited by Kirner in his edition of the *Dialogi* (p. 8) without a source reference, is obviously the correct date of Marsili's death (and not August 31, cited in Klette's edition, p. 13) since Lapo Mazzei wrote to Francesco Datini in a letter dated 1394, August 21: "Oggi è morto il maestro Luigi. . ." (See C. Guasti, *Lettere d'un notaro a un mercante del sec. XIV* [Firenze, 1880], vol. I, p. 67.)

<sup>3</sup> Only V. Rossi once remarked — in his *Scritti di critica letteraria*, vol. I [1930], p. 296 — that the *Dialogi* "possono anche essere stati scritti (nonostante il *nuper* della dedica) qualche anno dopo il 1401; ma in ogni modo non dopo il 1406, in cui morì Coluccio." But this was just a cursory remark made in oblivion of the vast mass of contradictory evidence, as is indicated by the oversight even of the circumstance that Vergerio lived in renewed personal contact with Bruni at the Curia from the spring 1405 on (see L. Smith, "Note cronologiche Vergeriane," *Archivio Veneto*, ser. V, vol. IV [1928], 113 f.), whereas Bruni in his dedication letter says that they were separated by "montes et valles" from one another.

A passage in a quite recent study of the *Dialogi* (D. Vittorini, "I Dialogi ad Petrum Histum di Leonardo Bruni Aretino . . .," *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America*, LV [1940], 715), "che la data di pubblicazione sia il 1406," need not be taken seriously; Vittorini's assertion of such a date (repeated by Th. E. Mommsen, in *Traditio*, VIII [1952], 383), although referring to Kirner's studies, is pointless because it omits the nerve

There are two other indications available that should be strong enough to remove any doubt. One is found by examining the wording and tenor of the dedication letter to Pier Paolo Vergerio. Vergerio had been Bruni's most intimate friend during their studies under Chrysoloras, but had left Florence permanently in the spring of 1400<sup>4</sup> — that is, about a year before the conversations related in the *Dialogi* are said to have taken place. The *Prooemium* addressed to him gives every indication that Bruni's separation from his friend was of recent date. "Almost no day passes," says Bruni, "that the memory of you does not repeatedly come back to me." He wishes, he goes on to say, that Vergerio had been able to remain in Florence. For in that case their studies would have profited, and would profit in the future, by the give and take of personal contact.<sup>5</sup> From the tenor of these introductory phrases one would surmise that Bruni was reporting shortly after one of the first intimate gatherings from which Vergerio was absent. And since the choice is only among Easter Sundays, even the Easter of 1402 — the second spring after Vergerio's departure — would appear to be too late.

This conjecture is borne out by the later part of the dedication. Just as Bruni uses the present tense when writing of his separation from Vergerio, so he does when telling of the conversations. "Though we are constantly yearning for your presence," he says, "we do so most of all when we occupy ourselves with one of those matters in which you used to take the greatest delight as long as you were here. Thus recently, when there was a conversation at Coluccio's house, I cannot tell you how much we wished you were with us . . . . That disputation, described in this book,

---

of Kirner's theory — the assumption of composition in successive phases. (Compare the discussion of Kirner's theory in Chapter IV, "Two Versions of the *Laudatio*? A Blind Alley.")

<sup>4</sup> Smith, "Note chronologiche Vergeriane," 102.

<sup>5</sup> "Itaque nulla fere dies praeterit, quin tua saepius in mentem nostram recordatio subeat." "Qua in civitate [meaning Florence] utinam tibi una nobiscum habitare licuisset. Non enim dubitamus quin consuetudine mutua studia nostra leviora fuissent et iocundiora futura." *Dialogi*, ed. Klette, p. 40; ed. Garin, p. 44.

I have sent to you in order that you, though absent, may be able to share in some way in our happiness."<sup>6</sup> It is easy to see how differently this commentary would have read if Bruni had written up the conversations long after the event. In that case, his dedication would have had to run something like this: Vergerio's loss had been keenly regretted by his friends ever since his departure but never as much as in a conversation that took place one or more years ago, on the first Easter holiday after he left; for this reason Bruni had now re-created the discussion as well as he could from memory and was communicating the record to his friend. The twofold fact that none of these or similar expressions, natural to someone writing one or more years after the event, flow from Bruni's pen, and that Bruni speaks of the "recent" debate in Salutati's house as of one of the matters with which "we occupy ourselves," makes it obvious that these passages were written not long after April of 1401. One could hardly venture to date them later than about the middle of that year. This is the same summer at which we arrived when counting about a year's time from Vergerio's departure.

Another helpful observation results from an analysis of the composition of the group depicted in the *Dialogi*. Besides Vergerio, a second familiar figure is missing in Bruni's picture: Poggio Bracciolini. How closely connected with the circle of the *Dialogi* Poggio felt, we may gather from a statement he made forty years later in his *Oratio Funebris* on Bruni. Then, in his old age, he still recalled with yearning the "*quasi renascens academia*" of his youth, whose associate ("*socius*") he once had been together with Salutati, Rossi, Niccoli, Bruni, and Lorenzo de' Medici.<sup>7</sup> This is precisely the group we find in Bruni's *Dialogi*, with the sole exception of Lorenzo de' Medici, socially the most eminent member,

<sup>6</sup> "Sed cum semper nobis tua praesentia desideretur, tunc tamen maxime, cum aliquid illarum rerum agimus quibus tu, dum aderas, delectari solebas: ut nuper, cum est apud Colucium disputatum, non possem dicere quantopere ut adesses desideravimus. . . Nos autem disputationem illam in hoc libro tibi descriptam misimus, ut tu, licet absens, commodis nostris aliqua ex parte fruaris." *Dialogi*, ed. Klette, pp. 40 f.; ed. Garin, p. 44.

<sup>7</sup> Poggio, *Oratio Funebris*, in Mehus' edition of Bruni's *Epistolae*, vol. I, p. CXVII.

whose absence from the holiday gathering under Salutati's roof is understandable. Given Poggio's indubitable membership in this company, it is strange that no one seems to have asked the question why Poggio is ignored in the *Dialogi*.

If the *Dialogi* were written in 1401, it would not be difficult to understand why Bruni failed to show Poggio as a member of the circle. For at that time Poggio can as yet hardly have belonged to the group. He had come to Florence a year or two earlier to prepare himself for the profession of notary, studies which he did not complete until 1402.<sup>8</sup> At Easter 1401, he had just reached his twenty-first birthday, and had been in the service of Salutati as a copyist for a few weeks, if at all before Easter.<sup>9</sup> Hence we have excellent reason to presume that in the spring and summer of 1401 he did not yet participate on equal terms in the discussions among Salutati's older friends and pupils.

Before long, however, the talented youth became an indispensable member of the circle. His stay in Florence ended as early as the autumn of 1403 when he accepted a position as papal *scriptor* at the Curia.<sup>10</sup> There must have been sufficient time for him to become intimate with the group; thus, he was indubitably a member in 1402 and the first part of 1403. Consequently, if Bruni had composed his work even very shortly after the end of 1401, the omission of Poggio would be a puzzle. It is true that even at a later time Bruni would have been justified in omitting the friend in picturing a debate which had occurred (or was represented as having occurred) in April 1401. Nevertheless, it is hard to believe that Bruni, if he wrote after Poggio had become an essential figure in the group, would have presented the life of the circle to the reading public without allowing Poggio his due, or without adding a word about the fact that the classicist revolt, as whose pioneers Niccoli and Bruni appear in the conversations, had a third champion in Poggio. After all, Bruni was under no compulsion to choose for his narrative an event long past.

<sup>8</sup> E. Walser, *Poggius Florentinus, Leben und Werke* (1914), pp. 10 f

<sup>9</sup> See Salutati's remark in his *Epistolario*, ed. Novati, vol. III, p. 505, and *ibid.*, note 2, compare Walser, *Poggius Florentinus*, p. 12.

<sup>10</sup> Walser, *Poggius Florentinus*, p. 19.

Added to the indications in the preface which point to the summer of 1401, the fact that Bruni could hardly have omitted Poggio from Salutati's circle in 1402, or later, definitely fixes the period in which the original plan of the work was conceived and the preface and *Dialogus I* were written.

### Excursus

#### INDICATIONS THAT *DIALOGUS II* WAS WRITTEN AFTER BRUNI HAD LEFT FLORENCE

While it is possible to prove with certainty that *Dialogus II* originated after the crisis of 1402, and even later than September 5, 1403, it is not easy to decide whether it was written during the subsequent one and a half years in which Bruni continued to live in Florence, or during the beginnings of his sojourn at the Curia, where he established himself as a papal secretary in the spring of 1405. The only thing one can say with assurance is that a work so deeply pervaded by Florentine civic interests and convictions as *Dialogus II* could not have been written after Bruni had been away from Florence for some length of time and had found at the Curia what he considered a new task in life. By a careful reconstruction of the development of Bruni's personal feelings during his early curial years one can establish that that vital boundary line lay in the first months of the year 1406.<sup>1</sup>

These observations make it possible to venture the hypothesis that *Dialogus II* was composed as late as the second half of 1405 when the Curia, including the chancellery officials Bruni and Poggio, spent a few quiet months in Viterbo, where both Bruni and Poggio were in frequent correspondence with their old master, Salutati, in Florence. In the letters then exchanged we come across a retraction by Poggio of previous harsh attacks on Petrarch — a retraction which has every appearance of standing in some relationship to Bruni's picture in *Dialogus II* of Niccoli's modification of his first-dialogue attacks and use of a more conciliatory attitude to the great men of the Trecento. It does not seem to be a far-fetched conclusion that *Dialogus II* originated about the time of Poggio's controversy with Salutati.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Compare the conclusions on the date of *Dialogus II*, drawn from the history of Bruni's feelings of attachment to Florence and to the Curia from 1403 to 1406, in *Crisis*, chapter 12, section "Florentine Sentiment in Bruni's Pre-Curial Period."

<sup>2</sup> See *Crisis*, chapter 12, sections "*Dialogus II* and the Early History of the Appraisal of Petrarch" and "The Time and Background of *Dialogus II*."



On the other hand, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that there are also some indications which at first sight would seem to pronounce against the possibility that *Dialogus II* was written after Bruni had left Florence.

One of the reasons for doubting that the second dialogue was composed late in 1405 at Viterbo is that it represents Salutati as saying that Bruni deserved special gratitude "since he daily undertakes for us the labors of translating from the Greek into the Latin language."<sup>3</sup> Does not this passage, one wonders, reflect the fresh experience of Bruni's contacts with Salutati in his Florentine years when he translated Basilus' *Homilia* and Plato's *Phaedon* at his teacher's request?<sup>4</sup> However, on second thought one recognizes that the quoted words point to a performance more specific than the translation of ancient texts chosen in accordance with Salutati's wishes or dedicated to him. What the passage implies is that Bruni was currently putting into Latin some materials which Salutati needed. Thus properly understood, it may easily apply to a time other than that when Bruni was occupied with the *Homilia* and the *Phaedon*; and the available evidence shows that the year which Bruni spent in Rome and Viterbo must be included in the period in which he continued to help his teacher and friend, and was naturally proud of it. At that time Salutati was at work on the final version of his *De Laboribus Herculis*, a handbook of classical mythology which, more than any of his earlier writings, required a knowledge of rare Greek sources; in the course of his labors he called repeatedly for Bruni's assistance. While Salutati may have been preparing the final version of the *Hercules* ever since the completion of his *Invectiva* in 1403, the *Hercules* became the center of his scholarly activities from the early part of the year 1405 on,<sup>5</sup> and Bruni, during 1405, sent Salutati the necessary translations and information from the Curia by letter.

That Bruni kept up this learned partnership after his departure from Florence can be established from several testimonies. In a portion

<sup>3</sup> "... quoniam . . . quotidie pro nobis labores suscipit e græcco in latinum sermone transferendo." *Dialogi*, ed. Klette, p. 71; ed. Garin, p. 80.

<sup>4</sup> The Basilus translation was dedicated to Salutati and probably made at his suggestion, and the *Phaedon* translation was certainly made at Salutati's request.

<sup>5</sup> Compare Salutati's statement in his *Ep. XIV 10*, February 1, 1405, *Epistolario* vol. IV, p. 76 f.: "Opus autem ingens cepi *De sensibus allegoricis fabularum Herculis*, quod quatuor distinxi voluminibus. . . . Secundum completum, non tamen correctum est; cetera, licet ad magnitudinem multam creverint, nec completa sunt nec ultimam limam per consequens habuerunt." As for "*De Sensibus Allegoricis Fabularum Herculis*" as the final title of the work, see *Crisis*, chapter 14, note 11.

of the text of the *Hercules* which with every probability belongs to the last phase of the work after January 1405, Salutati states that a long passage from Diodorus (which in print runs to more than one page) had been translated for him into Latin by Bruni, "an expert in both languages."<sup>6</sup> And in Bruni's correspondence we find that in August or September he sent from Viterbo information to Salutati on the meaning of Greek names<sup>7</sup> — information that was put to good use in the last chapter of the *Hercules* treatise which must have been written late in 1405 or early in 1406.<sup>8</sup> Once we consider these services which Bruni rendered to Salutati in 1405 and, in particular, during his stay at Viterbo, the assertion of *Dialogus II* that Bruni was assisting Salutati with translations from the Greek is seen to be in surprising accord with the actual happenings of that late period.

Another possible reason for doubt that *Dialogus II* was written after Bruni had left Florence lies in the composition of the circle among which the conversation takes place. In choosing Pietro di ser Mino as a newcomer to the debating group on the second day, Bruni appears to have selected a figure who could hardly attract much

<sup>6</sup> ". . . ut michi transtulit vir optimus Leonardus Aretinus, utriusque lingue peritus." *De Laboribus Herculis*, ed. B. L. Ullman (Zurich, 1951), p. 569. The fact that Salutati did not receive Bruni's Diodorus translation for use in the Fourth Book of *De Laboribus* until the year 1405, can be established by the following observations. First, in the comment of February 1, 1405, already cited, on the state of his preparations for *De Laboribus*, Salutati remarks that now, having completed the Second Book, he was starting ("cepi," meaning *coepi*) with the remainder of his work on an enlarged plan, and was going to supplement it at many points. Second, the Diodorus passage in question is found in the third chapter from the end in the unfinished last book. And, third, the passage is an insertion, as the clumsily repetitious connecting sentences clearly indicate. (Compare p. 569, lines 11 f. "ut aliquando de Charone concludam"; p. 571, line 3 f. "Sed ad Charonem revertamur"; and *ibid.*, line 16 "Et hec de Charone dicta sufficient").

A separate, perplexing question is from what source Bruni derived his knowledge of Diodorus, for all that seems to be known to us is that the first five books of Diodorus' *Bibliotheca* did not reach Italy until many years later, 1423, when Aurispa brought them from Byzantium (see Sabadini, *Le Scoperte*, vol. I, pp. 47 f.) — and the Diodorus passage Bruni translates is from Book I, 96. As late as 1449, when Poggio received from Pope Nicolaus V a manuscript of Diodorus lib. I-V for translation, it was still rare, and the text badly corrupted. (See Walser, *Poggius Florentinus* [1914], p. 230.) Perhaps one might hazard the hypothesis that Bruni gained access to a manuscript, possibly unique in Italy about 1405, in the curial circles.

<sup>7</sup> Bruni, *Ep. I 6* and *Ep. I 7*; ed. Mehus, I, 11-15.

<sup>8</sup> See Ullman, in his introduction to *De Laboribus Herculis*, p. VIII f.

interest outside of the Florentine local sphere. For although this young disciple of Salutati and friend of Bruni was highly regarded in Salutati's group,<sup>9</sup> he was little known outside of Florence since he had always been unproductive as a humanist and a writer. The objection that Bruni's choice could be expected to have been different had he written *Dialogus II* after his departure is reasonable, therefore.

Fortunately, we have a document which removes this doubt. It testifies not only to the continuance of close relations between Bruni and his former companion after his departure, but also to Bruni's desire to make Pietro's name known among the humanist literati at the Curia during the very years 1405-1406. In December 1406, when Pietro was elected Salutati's second successor in the Florentine chancellorship (on the occasion when Bruni no longer wished to compete for a Florentine office), Bruni sent him a most cordial letter of congratulation. He said that he saw in Pietro's election the crowning success of many efforts of Pietro's friends to which he, too, had contributed his best. In a paragraph not found in the book edition of Bruni's correspondence we read the following description of Bruni's own preceding efforts:<sup>10</sup> "Everybody with whom I have been in contact or conversation [that is, in the circle of humanists at the Curia] knows what sentiments and opinions I expressed about your talents, taste, eloquence, . . . agreeable manners, and courtesy, whenever the conversation turned to the culture of the people of today, thus giving me an opportunity for speaking up. Often when going with others for a walk, often when we were together in groups (*in coronis*), sometimes even during banquets when we talked about subjects of this kind, I have spoken of you in such a fashion that I made everybody immensely eager to see you face to face."<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> On Pietro di ser Mino da Montevarchi compare Novati, *Epistolario di Salutati*, III, 422-423, 523-526.

<sup>10</sup> Bruni, *Ep.* X 3, dated February 9, 1407. These passages of the letter come from the manuscripts Siena, Bibl. Comunale, H VI 26, and Venice, Bibl. Marciana, Cod. Lat. XIV, 31; they are included in F. P. Luiso's unpublished proofs of his *Studi su l'Epistolario di L. Bruni* (see Chapter IV, section 1, note 2). Our text has been reproduced from Luiso's proofs which this writer was allowed to consult for his studies.

<sup>11</sup> "Noverunt enim cuncti, quibus modo aliquis usus, vel conversatio mecum fuit, quid ego, quotiens de eruditione nostrorum hominum sermo incideret et facultas se obtulerit, de tuo ingenio facundia elegantia dicendi copia, quid praeterea de suavissimis moribus comitateque sentirem, qualem ego de te semper testimonium ferrem. Saepe in deambulationibus, saepe in coronis, nonnunquam etiam in conviviis cum huiusmodi sermo exoriretur, sic de te locutus sum, ut apud plerosque audientium magnam relinquerem aviditatem respiciendi tui."

On Bruni's attitude to the election of a Florentine chancellor in December 1406, see also pp. 111, 112 above.

Given this friendly interest of Bruni in promoting Pietro's renown in humanistic circles, it will no longer seem strange that Bruni, for the benefit of Pietro's prestige, gave him a place in that other "*corona*" depicted in *Dialogus II*. The incorporation of the figure of Pietro in the second dialogue may on the contrary be listed among the facts that add plausibility to the dating of the second dialogue late in the year 1405.

##### 5. SUMMARY A RECONSTRUCTED CHRONOLOGY OF LITERATURE AROUND 1400, AND A NEW PERSPECTIVE

By adding to our reconstruction of the controversy of the publicists the proof that both the *Laudatio* and *Dialogus II* were composed after 1402, we have furnished the last missing link for a new chronology and picture of political and humanistic literature around 1400. Henceforth it will be possible to render an intelligible account both of Bruni's beginnings as a humanist and of the effects of the Florentine-Milanese struggle on the rise of the politico-historical ideas which, not much later, found their first mature expression in Bruni's *History of the Florentine People*.

As for Bruni's personal development, it is sufficient to repeat that our recasting of the chronological data means that it is no longer necessary to assume that Bruni, without adequate preparation, emerged in the spring of 1400 as an accomplished translator and critic of Plato, as well as a mature historically and politically minded humanist. His real development was gradual, extending over the period from 1400 to 1404, or even 1405, and was vitally influenced by the events of 1402.

As for the impact of the contemporary political events upon the growth of Florentine thought, we may conclude our observations with a comparison between the accepted views and the emerging fresh picture.

As long as we follow the prevailing opinions about the chronology and genesis of the works written around 1400, it is not easy to discover any vital relationship between the new political and

historical ideas and the events which shook Italy at the turn of the Trecento. In this case we are forced to conclude from the discussions narrated in the *Paradiso degli Alberti* that substantial elements of the outlook of the fifteenth-century Florentine humanists had germinated at a time when the effects of the struggle with Giangaleazzo had hardly been felt; and that the ideas produced in those early years were developed in Bruni's *Laudatio*, *Dialogus I*, and *Dialogus II* during the years 1400 and 1401, that is in a period when Florence had as yet not passed through the agitating experiences of her final life-and-death struggle with the Milanese tyrant. Not until 1403, in the two replies to Viscontean propaganda from the pens of Salutati and Cino Rinuccini written in answer to the allegedly not much older Milanese challenge by Antonio Loschi, could we claim to find in Florentine literature perceptible traces of the stirring events of the Giangaleazzo era.

If the chronology set forth in this study is adopted, the first major correction which must be made results from the realization that students of the Florentine Renaissance, in accepting the *Paradiso*, a work of the early Quattrocento, as an authentic source for the late Trecento, have read into the Trecento world the intellectual habits and attainments of a later period. After the anachronistic touches have been removed, and the alleged conversations of the year 1389 have been shown to be largely of a fictitious nature, we may conclude that the factors which were to transform Florentine Humanism and thought did not emerge until the turn of the century. These factors were, in addition to the uncompromising pioneering spirit of a new classicism, the resistance against a deadly threat to the independence of the regional centers of politics and culture, and the salvation of the "*libertas Italiae*" under Florence's championship — experiences which acted as a sudden spur and caused political ideas and historiography to move in a new direction.

Once the necessary chronological changes have been made, every work in the indicated list reveals its true place and significance by its relationship to the political events. The story begins with the propaganda invective against Florence by Antonio Loschi

and with the Florentine responses by Cino Rinuccini and Salutati; these writings reflect the political temper and outlook in Milan and Florence in 1397, the opening year of the decisive conflagrations. But the climax came when Florence, standing alone, met the challenge to her liberty in 1402. Salutati's literary production reveals the penetrating effects in its shift from the almost promonarchical attitude of his *De Tyranno* in 1400-01 to the final version of his anti-Viscontean *Invectiva* in 1402-03. An even more creative transformation in spirit took place in Bruni. It can be traced in his development from the ideas of *Dialogus I*, an echo in 1401 of Niccoli's scorn of Florence's pre-humanistic traditions, to the ideas of the *Laudatio* and *Dialogus II*, first-fruits of Bruni's civic Humanism and products of the period between the summer of 1403 and the spring of 1406.

Finally, shortly after 1406, a latecomer to this group of literature, and, as may be said of all the indicated writings, a further precursor of Bruni's *Historiae Florentini Populi*, the *magnum opus* of the period, appeared in Gregorio Dati's *Istoria di Firenze*. Like the rest, this work had been inspired by the insights and sentiments produced by the Florentine resistance to Giangaleazzo, especially in the decisive year 1402 when, in Dati's own words, "all the freedom of Italy lay in the hands of the Florentines alone."

## CHAPTER VII

### THE GENESIS OF BRUNI'S ANNOTATED LATIN VERSION OF THE (PSEUDO-) ARISTOTELIAN *ECONOMICS* (1420-1421)

The manner in which the two books of Bruni's Latin version and annotation of the (pseudo-) Aristotelian *Economics* originated is of some relevance for an understanding of the process of composition of the *Dialogi*. In the case of the *Economics*, we have from a later and better known period of Bruni's life an example which, in the light of reliable records, duplicates some of the occurrences that can be merely inferred for the *Dialogi* and the time of Bruni's youth: initial completion and publication of only the first part of a two-part work, and addition of the second part at a time when the extension of the work was too late to affect the dedication preface.

In Bruni's labors on the *Economics* we have before us the successive publication, first, of *one* book of a translation, together with a commentary, and, second, of the continuation of the text together with the respective portion of the annotation. It should be noted at once that in the case of Book II we cannot really speak of a "translation." The Greek original of the third book of the *Economics* — that which Bruni, omitting the second book of the original, presented as his Book II — had been lost by Bruni's time, and he merely adapted one or two medieval translations to humanistic taste.<sup>1</sup> This fact must be remembered in the course of the discussions which follow.

<sup>1</sup>For the nature of the third book of the *Economics* (Bruni's Book II),

The two phases, thus defined, of Bruni's work on the *Economics* are in the first place suggested by the evidence of two manuscripts.<sup>2</sup> Cod. Laur. 79 c. 19, composed of Bruni's dedication preface to Cosimo de' Medici and both books of the *Economics* each followed by its commentary — an authoritative manuscript because it was written by one of the best-known scribes of Cosimo de' Medici — shows at the end of the commentary to Book I the following scribe's inscription: "*Finis Commentarii super primo Libro Oeconomicorum. Leonardus Arretinus edidit. Antonius Marius Florentinus scripsit V. Non. Martii [March 3] MCCCCXIX. Valeas qui legis.*"<sup>3</sup> In view of the provenience of the manuscript, the year is indubitably given "*stilo florentino*," that is, it means the twelve months from March 25, 1419 to March 24, 1420. The *March 3* on which this copy of Book I with its commentary was finished was, therefore, that of 1420; and, judging from the part played in Bruni's and Cosimo de' Medici's circle by Antonio di Mario as a scribe of first and dedication copies, we can hardly doubt that the form "*Leonardus Arretinus edidit. Antonius Marius scripsit*" indicates that Bruni had just completed work on Book I when Antonio's copy was written.<sup>4</sup>

and for the character of Bruni's work as a translator and reviser, see B. Hauréau's "Mémoire Sur Quelques Traductions de *L'Économique* D'Aristote," *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Mémoires*, XXX (1881), part I, pp. 463-482; and *Aristotelis Quae Feruntur Oeconomica*, rec. F. Susemihl (Leipzig: Teubner, 1887), pp. XVII-XX.

<sup>2</sup> See the writer's "Chronologie von Brunis Schriften," in *Bruni, Schriften*, pp. 164 f., where, however, it was not yet seen that the divergent dates for Book I and Book II found in some manuscripts reveal successive publication, not only composition, of the two books, and that these chronological notes must be interpreted *stilo florentino*.

<sup>3</sup> A. M. Bandini, *Catal. codd. Lat. Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*, vol. III (1776), col. 179.

<sup>4</sup> We cannot assert more than that "we can hardly doubt" since Laur. 79 c. 19 does not seem to be the dedication copy of 1420 with Book II added later, as might be presumed at first sight. For although it has the library note, "*Liber Petri de Medicis Cos. F.*," and, presumably, was originally a volume in Cosimo's library, it shows a substantial number of corrections in its text, so as to fail to give the impression of a dedication copy. The manuscript may have an even earlier origin, however; it may be the first clean copy of the work from which the dedication copy was subsequently transcribed.



The second manuscript, Firenze Bibl. Naz. Cod. Conv. soppr. C 7 2677, is remarkable because it comes from one of the old Florentine monasteries; it represents a collection of all of Bruni's translations of Aristotelian writings (*Ethics*, *Economics*, and *Politics*), lists the correct dates ("stilo florentino") of *Ethics* and *Politics*, and at the end of *Economics* notes "*Aristotelis philosophi economicorum seu de re familiari liber II. et ultimus explicit. Leonardus Aretinus traduxit e Greco MCCCCXX. Feliciter.*"<sup>5</sup> It is true that the scribe in assuming translation of *both* books from the Greek commits a grave, though pardonable, error for reasons which we shall discuss presently; but the chronological information he transmits is of the highest value. Since we already know the earlier origin of Book I, the colophon reporting the time of the completion of the whole work tells us that Book II was added between March 25, 1420 and March 24, 1421.

The composition of Bruni's *commentary* to Book II may be attributed to the same period, even though we find no chronological evidence in the manuscripts; for a comparison of the Latin text of Book II as revised by Bruni with his commentary on Book II discloses that the commentary in some places still quotes the medieval Latin version; in other words, it was worked out before Bruni had finished his revision of the medieval text.<sup>6</sup> Consequently, the course of Bruni's labors on the *Economics* appears to have been the following: After having translated, annotated, and published (that is to say, sent to Cosimo with a dedication) Book I, Bruni proceeded to the annotation of Book II, using as his basis

<sup>5</sup> Bruni, *Schriften*, p. 236. As there stated, the commentary on the *Economics* is included at the end of the manuscript; but since it is undated, it does not give us help in a chronological investigation.

<sup>6</sup> To give one example: At one point of his commentary to Book II, Bruni emphasizes the "praise of married life" already found in Homer and Aristotle. He quotes the words "*nullum maius bonum*" (wording according to Laur. 79 c. 19 and other codices) from the Latin text of Book II. The quoted words, or more precisely, "*nihil enim maius bonum in hominibus ait [inquit] esse*," are the reading of the medieval translation (see *Aristotelis Quae Feruntur Oeconomica*, rec. Susemihl, pp. 58 f.), whereas Bruni's revision of the text was finally to run: "*Inquit enim: nihil melius esse posse hominibus*" (wording according to *GW* vol. II nr. 2438, about 1499, and to other early printings).

the only text available to him, the medieval Latin translation (or, translations). He revised this text in accordance with humanistic taste as his work went on, until eventually the revised version of Book II, together with its commentary, was added to the already published text and annotation of Book I.

With these inferences from the manuscript evidence we must compare and integrate the information which we can draw from Bruni's dedicatory preface addressed to Cosimo de' Medici.<sup>7</sup> Here Bruni talks of his attached "translation"; "I have translated [this work] from the Greek," he states expressly.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore the preface apologizes for the very small volume of the work; it should be highly valued, the author says, although it is merely a "brief text" and a "tiny thing."<sup>9</sup> All this would be true to fact if we assume that Bruni had in mind solely Book I which, in full contrast to Book II, is indeed a "translation from the Greek," as well as a "tiny thing" of less than 1500 words (barring the commentary).

When, in a previous chapter of our book, the dedication preface of Bruni's *Dialogi* was discussed, we mentioned that Bruni stated therein in unequivocal terms that he was sending to Vergerio "*disputationem illam*" described "*in hoc libro*." These words, we found, occur in the preface to the *Dialogi* even though the work in its present form is actually composed of two "*libri*," or two "*disputationes*" held on two successive days.<sup>10</sup> From this discrepancy we concluded that at the time of Bruni's dedication to Vergerio only one of the dialogues can have been in existence; and it is also possible to observe that Bruni in all his literary works is faithful to the classical custom of indicating, in the dedications as well as titles, the exact number of the component parts or

<sup>7</sup> Published in Bruni, *Schriften*, pp. 120 f.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 121, quoted in note 12 below. Bruni repeated his assertion in his *Ep. V 2* (written between 1420 and 1428): "Librum Aristotelis qui inscribitur *οικονομικά* in latinum verteram e graeco." (Ed. Mehus, II, 9).

<sup>9</sup> "Tu igitur, Cosma dulcissime, hoc quicquid est libelli ob paginae brevitatem nequaquam despexeris. Pusillum quidem est, at viribus amplum et pretio dignum." Bruni, *Schriften*, p. 120.

<sup>10</sup> See above, p. 127.

books.<sup>11</sup> If, therefore, we are right in our present inference that Bruni's dedication of the *Economics* was accompanied by the translation and annotation of only one book, we must expect the *Economics* preface likewise to talk of "the book" (*liber*), and not of "the books" (*libri*), sent to Cosimo. This is precisely what we find. "You will read the precepts on this matter," Bruni tells Cosimo, "in this booklet (*in hoc libello*) of Aristotle, which I have not only translated, . . . but to which I have also attached a commentary (*explanationem quamdam*) to explain the more obscure words."<sup>12</sup> Both text and commentary are here spoken of in the singular, just as the *Dialogi* preface speaks of *one* book and *one* disputation. On the other hand, at a later time when Book II of the *Economics* existed also, Bruni in a letter referred to his work as "the small books" (*libellos quosdam*).<sup>13</sup> Consequently, our conjecture from the manuscript evidence—that Book I was separately published—is confirmed, and we may be finally sure that when the dedication preface was sent to Cosimo it referred to Book I alone.

The dedication preface to the *Economics* allows us also to round out the chronological reconstruction of the time when Bruni was at work. According to the dedication, he worked on Book I "*per has ferias*."<sup>14</sup> Since the copy of Book I preserved in Antonio di Mario's transcription was completed as we have seen on March 3, 1420, the *feriae* mentioned in the dedication would seem to be the "*feriae antecineriales*," the Shrovetide week, which in 1420 fell in February 13–20. This week, we may assume, is the

<sup>11</sup> A list of titles of Bruni's works showing his strict adherence to this custom is found in *Crisis*, chapter 11, at the beginning of the section "The Literary Structure of the *Dialogi*."

<sup>12</sup> "Tu igitur harum praecepta rerum in *hoc libello* Aristotelis leges, quem ego non solum transtuli e Graeco, ut maxime consonum esse putavi, verum etiam *explanationem quamdam* obscuriorum verborum adiunxi, quo tibi legenti dilucidior esset." *Bruni, Schriften*, p. 121.

<sup>13</sup> *Ep. V* 2, ed. Mehus, II, 9. But in the same letter, when referring to the work he had "translated from the Greek" and dedicated to Cosimo, he talked of "*librum* Aristotelis qui inscribitur *οικονομικά*" and "*hunc librum* mittens ad amicum." See note 8 above.

<sup>14</sup> In *Bruni, Schriften*, p. 120, lines 16 f.

precise time of the translation and annotation of Book I, while the dedication to Cosimo was written either the same week, or immediately afterwards, between February 21 and March 2, 1420.

Our findings on the development of Bruni's work on the *Economics* have an interesting consequence in that they settle an old controversy over his good faith and reliability as a scholar. It was more than three-quarters of a century ago that V. Rose, first critical editor of the Aristotelian and pseudo-Aristotelian fragments, reached the conclusion that Bruni had never seen the third book of the Greek original of the *Economics* (Bruni's Book II), of which no traces are known in modern times except Bruni's apparent claim to having translated it. Bruni, said Rose, in spite of his assertion that he had "translated from the Greek," had for Book II merely adapted medieval translations of the Greek text lost by the Quattrocento. It seemed to Rose unavoidable, therefore, to accede, though in a somewhat modified fashion, to the accusation which earlier scholars, such as Fabricius, had long raised against Bruni: that he was guilty of a deception. While those accusers had assumed that our so-called third book of the *Economics* (Bruni's Book II) was Bruni's free invention, Rose's demonstration that Bruni had adapted medieval translations seemed to still leave him guilty of an attempt to mislead his readers about his sources and the real nature of his work.<sup>15</sup>

In 1881 B. Hauréau, in the *Mémoires de l'Institut National de France*,<sup>16</sup> made a desperate effort to clear Bruni of this suspicion by insisting on Bruni's seriousness and eminence as a scholar. Hauréau argued that precise contentions of a student of Bruni's stature, stating "*quod ego per has ferias e Graeco interpretatus [sum]*" and "*quem ego . . . transtuli e Graeco, ut maxime consonum esse putavi*,"<sup>17</sup> must not be suspected without clear evidence as being even partially untrue. Instead, said Hauréau, one must draw the only conclusion left: Bruni had been in possession

<sup>15</sup> V. Rose, *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus* (Leipzig, 1863), p. 644. See also Hauréau, "Mémoire Sur Quelques Traductions," p. 480.

<sup>16</sup> See note 1 above.

<sup>17</sup> See Bruni, *Schriften*, p. 120, lines 16-17, p. 121, lines 7-8.

of a Greek manuscript, later lost, that included Book II. To render this possibility plausible, Hauréau presented a series of bold hypotheses on how some unique manuscripts of Greek works might have come from Byzantium to Italy, only to perish there in the incessant party strife among the Italian patricians who, as patrons of scholarship, gained possession of them. "It is worthwhile," he concluded, to consider possibilities of this sort; "*l'honneur d'un savant, d'un lettré, d'un galant homme, est en jeu.*"<sup>18</sup>

Hauréau's conjectures, well-intentioned but unsupported and unlikely as they were, have not been able to reestablish Bruni's integrity; to this day he stands accused of deceitfulness, and his apparent dishonesty has in the eyes of modern critics helped to discredit the scholarship of the humanists of the early Italian Renaissance. Yet Hauréau's chivalrous refusal to rashly pronounce a great scholar a liar was sound, as is now proven by the discovery that the two books of Bruni's *Economics* originated successively, and that the preface sent to Cosimo de' Medici was accompanied by the *translated* Book I alone.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Hauréau, "Mémoire," pp. 478-482.

<sup>19</sup> The fact that Bruni to this day has remained under the suspicion of gross unreliability has just made itself felt for another time. After the present chapter had been written, the author received a copy of Eugenio Garin's *Le Traduzioni Umanistiche di Aristotele nel Secolo XV* (Florence, 1951, reprinted from "Atti dell' Accademia Fiorentina di Scienze Morali 'La Colombaria,'" 1950). On pp. 11 f. of this fundamental treatise, which must be used as an indispensable guide in all future studies of Aristotle in the Renaissance, as well as in a note published by Garin in *Rinascimento*, II (1951), 326, the contradiction between Bruni's claim of having "translated" from the Greek and the indubitable fact of his sole reliance in Book II on medieval translations is brought out in detail; again Bruni's supposedly "strange way of considering a work a 'translation'" ("il curioso modo di intendere le traduzioni, che aveva l'Aretino") is casting its shadow over his conduct as a scholar. This writer, who, because of his ignorance in 1928 (in his "Chronologie von Brunis Schriften") of the true bearing of the case, shares the guilt for the long perpetuation of the injustice done to Bruni's memory, can only hope that the present explanation of the mystery will quickly be taken into consideration.

## CHAPTER VIII

### AN EPISTOLARY DESCRIPTION BY BRUNI

#### OF THE FLORENTINE CONSTITUTION IN 1413

##### 1. PROBLEMS OF AUTHENTICITY AND DATE

Manuscript 1200 of the Biblioteca Riccardiana in Florence, on fol. 156v-157r, contains an incomplete letter with the heading *Leonardi Aretini ad magnum principem imperatorem*. In this document without indication of date and place Bruni, if he indeed is the author, undertakes to describe "the form of our republic, and its structure of government" (*formam rei publice nostre et gubernandi figuram*). Here, then, we have available a precious piece of information to serve us as a counterpart to the description of the "*instituta domestica*" in the *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis*.<sup>1</sup> The letter seems not to be known in any other transcript, but, as the following examination will show, the place of its preservation inspires confidence that it is genuine.

Ms. Ricc. 1200 is a mid-Quattrocento miscellany known to scholars because it contains *rara* and even *unica* of Florentine origin, or composed in Florence.<sup>2</sup> The scribe, who in several places gives his name, Angelo di Gasparre Marchi, as well as the date when he copied certain pieces (1446 to 1453), was a citizen-

<sup>1</sup> *Laudatio*, L fol. 152r-155r; ed. Klette, pp. 98-104.

<sup>2</sup> The following notes are based on the information about Ms. Ricc. 1200 and its scribe given by G. Zippel in *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, XXIV (1894), 166-168, as well as on the description of the manuscript in *I Manoscritti della R. Biblioteca Riccardiana di Firenze, Manoscritti Italiani*. Vol. I ("Indici e Cataloghi," vol. XV, Rome, 1900), ed. S. Morpurgo, pp. 261-270.

statesman from Volterra with humanistic interests. We know that he was one of the envoys who were sent in 1429 from Volterra to the Florentine Government to protest against the inclusion of Volterra in the newly established Florentine *Catasto*, and who were forcibly detained in Florence until Volterra submitted some time later. This period of detention gave Marchi ample opportunity to copy for his own use rare Florentine material not obtainable elsewhere; and certain other pieces in the miscellany allow us to determine what contacts he must have made among Florentine humanists. For the manuscript contains not only many works by Bruni and his circle, among them several of the year 1429 or shortly before that date; there are also a few otherwise rare letters, of the same period, by Filelfo who came to Florence in 1429 to lecture, stayed for some years, and joined the group of humanists who were then in conflict with Niccoli. A few folios after the letter *Ad magnum principem imperatorem*, we find one of the three known copies of Lorenzo di Marco de' Benvenuti's *Invectiva* against Niccoli, composed around 1420 — a work which may be considered a product from Bruni's circle.<sup>3</sup> Since Bruni had been chancellor since 1427 it is likely that he had official dealings with the hostages of the subject city. It is also quite understandable that the humanist statesman from Volterra would be interested in a letter containing a description of the Florentine constitution, and would ask Bruni for permission to copy it.<sup>4</sup>

From the opening passages of the letter we can reconstruct the situation in which it must have been written. The addressee is an unnamed emperor. The writer reports that he has been asked by

<sup>3</sup>See *Crisis*, Appendix 5, "An Informant on Niccoli: Lorenzo di Marco de' Benvenuti," esp. the concluding pages.

<sup>4</sup>This does not mean that the copy preserved in Ricc. 1200 was made in 1429. Marchi wrote large portions, and perhaps all, of the Riccardianus in the 1440's and 1450's, certain parts even later — some of the pieces are of 1463 — intending the manuscript as a bequest to his family. He may have then recopied the extensive material he had collected in 1429. However, the manuscript would require detailed examination, because, according to the successive subscription dates contained in it, the text cannot have been written in the sequence in which we have it, and consequently may be made up of material of different origin and age.

this emperor to send him a letter describing the constitution of "our republic." Since the constitution described in the letter is indubitably that of Florence, the writer, who speaks of "our republic" (*res publica nostra*), is a Florentine. As to the exposé of the Florentine conditions, the similarity to passages in the *Laudatio* is so strong that the author of the letter must have been Bruni, or must have pirated the essentials of his analysis from Bruni's *Laudatio*.

A special feature of the situation in which the letter originated is indicated by the following passage. The author accepts the emperor's request to describe the Florentine constitution "in a letter of mine" (*per meas litteras*) by saying that the assignment would really call for "longer leisure" beyond the "present pressure of time" (*huius angustie temporis*). But since the emperor expressed such an urgent desire, the writer would nonetheless "put down something for you" (*scribam tibi aliquid*) and "in view of this your departure, I shall rapidly go over the matter with you" (*et pro hoc discessu tuo una tecum decurrens properabo*).

Two facts may be gathered from this reaction of the writer. In the first place, the letter was not written in the course of a normal correspondence between two persons living in different places, but the writer and the addressee had stayed together in one place and had been in personal contact; for if both had not met shortly before the letter was written, it would be difficult to see why the writer was relating the hurry of his writing to the addressee's imminent departure (*discessus*) from the place. Secondly, the reference to this "departure" excludes situations in which the addressee could not be expected by the writer to leave the place of their meeting in the immediate future. Do we know about Bruni's relations to an emperor that would fit these conditions?

In his memoirs, the *Rerum Suo Tempore Gestarum Commentarius*, Bruni reports about his contacts with Emperor Sigismund (the only "emperor" with whom he can have had the presupposed relations) as follows: "We first saw this prince in Piacenza, at



the occasion of his meeting with Pope John [XXIII], and during our stay at Lodi and at Cremona we became somewhat acquainted with him and had some conversations. Later, in Constance, his disposition and character became more familiar to us.”<sup>6</sup> These notes on 1413–15 events are found in the description of Sigismund’s expedition to Italy in 1431–33, and although Bruni does not say so expressly, he met the emperor for another time on that occasion; for we have an oration formally delivered by Bruni as an envoy before an emperor that cannot be anything but a speech addressed to Sigismund in those years.<sup>6</sup>

A careful weighing of all details known of the situation in the early 1430’s, however, excludes the possibility that contacts between Bruni and Sigismund such as the letter presupposes may have occurred in that period. During Sigismund’s slow progress toward Rome, a state of tension and at times outright military conflict existed between Florence and the emperor. In 1432 and early in 1433, Florence was at war with the Republic of Lucca, and Sigismund, in 1432, stayed inside Lucca’s walls while his men participated in the clashes of the troops of Lucca with the Florentine army.<sup>7</sup> Subsequently, the emperor went so far as to issue a decree ordering the seizure of Florentine citizens and their possessions within the territories under his rule; and Bruni, in his capacity as Florentine chancellor, composed several official letters protesting against these measures and justifying Florence’s conduct toward the emperor as well as toward Lucca.<sup>8</sup> Under these circumstances it is extremely improbable that Bruni met the emperor on his way to Rome. In the second half of 1433, to be sure,

<sup>6</sup> “Hunc Principem nos Placentiae primum vidimus in congressu illo Johannis Romani Pontificis et aliquem cum eo usum conversationemque habuimus, dum Laudae Cremonaeque constitimus. Postea vero Constantiae magis naturam illius moresque conspeximus.” *Rer. Suo Temp. Gest. Comm.* (see Chapter IV, section 2, note 6), p. 451.

<sup>7</sup> *Oratio apud Imperatorem*. See the reference in Bruni, *Schriften*, pp. 174 f.

<sup>8</sup> J. G. Aschbach, *Geschichte Kaiser Sigmund’s*, vol. IV (Hamburg, 1845), pp. 78–82.

<sup>9</sup> See *Deutsche Reichstagsakten*, vol. X (Gotha, 1906), ed. H. Herre, nos. 302 (Nov. 20, 1432) and 423 (Febr. 8, 1433) — both phrased by Bruni.

when Sigismund, after his coronation as emperor, returned north, the tension with Florence had somewhat abated. It must have been in Umbria, presumably at Todi, that a Florentine delegation paid the city's formal respects; and the short address of Bruni that has come down to us must on that occasion have been delivered by him as a member of the delegation.<sup>9</sup> The closing words of the speech indicate that a political conference with the emperor was to take place afterwards. But this conference was certainly not a meeting at which Bruni was alone with Sigismund; its purpose may be gathered from some allusions Bruni makes. "Although he [the emperor] had felt gravely offended by the Florentines at Lucca," Bruni writes, "he did not seem to be of an unfriendly mind." The emperor wished to continue on his way via Florence, but the Florentine government refused him admission into the city, and he had to make his return journey along the eastern route, through Perugia, Rimini, and Ravenna.<sup>10</sup> It is hardly conceivable that Sigismund, after the unfavorable outcome of this conference had forced him to decide upon the long and burdensome detour along the eastern coast, should have met with the Florentine chancellor in private conversation and asked him for a verbal and written description of the Florentine constitution.

To this improbability inherent in the situation must be added that Bruni's memoirs, which make mention of private conversations with the emperor in Lodi and Cremona, and of personal contacts with him in Constance, contain nothing of the sort for

<sup>9</sup> That Bruni met the Emperor in Todi may be inferred from his memoirs (*Rer. Suo Temp. Gest. Comm.*, p. 451), which mention Todi, Perugia, Rimini, and Ravenna as towns the Emperor passed through, and also report that Sigismund on his return journey sought permission to travel through Florence (a point to be discussed presently). The fork of the road where he had to choose between the westerly and the easterly route was at Todi. It is probably this consideration which made Aschbach, *Geschichte Kaiser Sigmund's*, IV, 488, assume that Sigismund and Bruni met at Todi.

These conclusions, incidentally, date Bruni's *Oratio apud Imperatorem* (referred to in note 6 above) with precision. In the writer's "Chronologie von Brunis Schriften" (1928), *Bruni, Schriften*, pp. 174 f., the speech was loosely dated "1432-33," but, in view of the Emperor's itinerary and stay at Todi, it may be placed between August 15 and August 29, 1433.

<sup>10</sup> *Rer. Suo Temp. Gest. Comm.*, p. 451.

the years 1432-33; that both the content and origin of the manuscript in which the letter has been preserved make it seem likely that the letter existed in 1429; and that the letter contains an error which can hardly have been committed by the author at the time when he was chancellor of Florence. For the description of the Florentine city councils, given in the letter, says that "there were about four hundred persons" in each of the two general citizen councils, the *Consilium Populi* and the *Consilium Communis*.<sup>11</sup> Actually, the Florentine councils were never so large, nor were they equal in size. In Bruni's lifetime, according to the Florentine Statutes of 1415, the membership of the *Consiglio del Popolo* was just below three hundred, and that of the *Consiglio del Comune* somewhat less than two hundred.<sup>12</sup> In the 1430's, during his chancellorship, Bruni must, of course, have known the facts in every detail, and in his Greek pamphlet *On the Politeia of the Florentines*, written 1438/39,<sup>13</sup> we read indeed: "There are two councils in this city: one taken from the entire citizenry, numbering three hundred men; the other of two hundred men, taken from among the more distinguished."<sup>14</sup> If the letter had been written two decades earlier, during Bruni's stay at the Curia — the other period during which, according to his memoirs, he had meetings with the emperor — it would be quite understandable that he was unacquainted with the precise number of members in each council. Since no members served longer than six months, Bruni may have vaguely remembered that, not counting

<sup>11</sup> "Consilia vero civitatis duo sunt: unum populi, in quo circiter quadringenti viri existunt; alterum communis, quod est mistum ex nobilitate et plebe, pari fere numero cum superiori."

<sup>12</sup> The "consilium del capitaneo et populi" was to be filled with 285 members, "civibus Florentinis popularibus, et guelfis, et mixtim de septem maioribus artibus, et scioperatis, et de XIV minoribus artibus." The "Consilium Communis" was to be filled with 192 members, "civibus Florentinis popularibus, et guelfis, mixtim extrahendi ut supra." *Statuta Populi et Communis Florentiae, publica auctoritate collecta . . . anno salutis MCCCCXV* (Ed. Friburgi, 1778-1783), vol. II, pp. 659-661.

<sup>13</sup> For this date see *Crisis*, chapter 18, note 37.

<sup>14</sup> "Concilia in hac urbe sunt duo: alterum quidem ex universo populo tercentum virorum, alterum vero ducentorum e splendidioribus." Ed. Galletti, p. 94.

ginal route; he and the pope remained together in Lodi until Christmas, and during that stay there was no urgent business making demands on the emperor's time. In the end, Sigismund escorted pope and Curia as far as Cremona, where he and John again spent several days together, even finding time to climb a high tower to enjoy the panorama of northern Italy before the Curia continued on its way to Bologna.<sup>17</sup> The emperor stayed on in Cremona for a while, to work out measures for the administration of Hungary during his absence, and to issue various privileges, and then returned to Piacenza and continued his journey to northwestern Italy. He did not leave Cremona until the middle of February 1414.<sup>18</sup>

Under these circumstances it is difficult to determine the exact moment when Bruni, either in Lodi or in Cremona, wrote the letter in question. He could not have spoken of the emperor's impending "*discessus tuus*" at the end of the stay of Sigismund and the Curia in Lodi — not, at any rate, after it had been decided that the emperor would accompany the Curia to Cremona. After the stay in Cremona, there can be no question of a "*discessus*" since Sigismund stayed on for several weeks. We may conclude, therefore, that the letter was written with reference to some other departure, planned but not performed, of which we do not know. Rapid changes in the emperor's travel plans during those weeks can readily be imagined. For his prolonged stay at Lodi, and his journey to Cremona, were digressions from his main route that had not been provided for originally, neither in point of place nor in point of time. After December 9, when the negotiations about the site of the Council had been concluded, the emperor's return to Piacenza was only a matter of time, and the prolongation of his stay at Lodi or the detour to Cremona may easily have been due to a sudden decision, taken after a conversation with Bruni that had seemed a farewell. The fact that Bruni's letter — begun at the urgent insistence of the emperor — was not completed is a circumstance demanding an explanation. A sudden

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 375-377.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 378.

change in the emperor's plans could easily have been the cause. But be that as it may, it seems certain that Bruni's letter originated at some time during the meetings of pope and emperor in Lodi and Cremona, that is, during December of 1413, and presumably after December 9.

The fixing of this date is of importance since it allows us to fit the letter into a phase of Bruni's thinking of which we are otherwise insufficiently informed. The letter is the first sign after the writing of the *Laudatio* of Bruni's continued interest in the *Respublica Florentina*. It shows that even during his curial period he remained to some extent a "Florentine" who preserved an intimacy with the conditions of Florentine life that normally would be expected only from Florentine citizens. The letter also serves to supplement the analysis of the Florentine institutions contained in the *Laudatio* and bridge the gap between that early portrait of Florence and Bruni's subsequent appraisal of Florence's institutional life in his "*Oratio Funebris* on Nanni degli Strozzi" in 1428 — supplying a document which makes it possible to reconstruct the gradual development of Bruni's interpretation of the Florentine constitution.<sup>10</sup> In addition, since Bruni's letter to Sigismund in the form we have it exhibits all the characteristics of a first rapid penning, we here have a precious opportunity for an intimate study of Bruni's manner of writing in the stage preceding literary elaboration.

## 2. AN EDITION OF BRUNI'S UNPUBLISHED LETTER<sup>1</sup>

Leonardi Aretini ad magnum principem imperatorem.

Rem magnam ac perdifficilem, generosissime princeps, et non huius angustie temporis sed longioris otii dignam postulas, formam rei publice nostre et gubernandi figuram tibi per meas litteras ostendi.

<sup>10</sup> The letter has so been used for the concluding chapter of *Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance*, in the section "Freedom and the Florentine Constitution."

<sup>1</sup> Until now, only the superscription, the *incipit*, and the *explicit* of the letter have been accessible through their listing in *Indici e Cataloghi* (see Chapter VIII, section 1, note 2). The piece was not known to this writer when he composed his "Chronologie von Brunis Schriften" in 1928, and

Que cum sit maxima atque fusissima, quis eam paucis (*ms. paucis*) querat absolvere? An vero si membra hominum describantur, quem ad modum et M. Cicero, et Lactantius, facit, longa scribendi materia fit? Nos autem in civitate, que infinitam vim complectitur hominum, describenda breviter id fieri posse existimamus. Preterea non satis (? *ms. vis*) est<sup>2</sup> sitne aliquid in re publica maiorum auctoritate constitutum; sed quam ob rem id constitutum, intelligere oportet atque exponere. Causa enim rei scientiam facit. Cause vero et difficiles cognitu sunt, et prolixè explicatu. Scribam tibi aliquid quoniam tu ita flagitas; et pro hoc discessu tuo una tecum decurrens properabo.

Primum igitur intelligendum est: species gubernandarum civitatum legimus esse tres, totidem ut philosophi vocant labes. Aut enim unus gubernat; quod dicitur regnum. Aut prestantes quidam viri; quam gubernandi speciem (*ms. spem*) Greci aristocratiam, nostri optimates dixere. Aut populus ipse regit; que species a Grecis democratia (*ms. diomacritia*), a nostris vero popularis status nominatur. Harum autem trium specierum legitimarum tres item labes consignantur. Nam regia quidem potestas, si non pro commodo eorum qui regno subsunt hominum exercetur, in tyrannidem transit. Et due relique species, nisi legitime pureque habeantur, in suas item labes corrutelasque demigrant. Similes autem earum in privatis libet intueri. Patris enim imperium erga filios regni instar obtinet. Presidet enim filiis pater; eque gubernat et regit pro eorum utilitate. At non sic dominus (*ms. dominos*) erga servos. Non enim servorum utilitas a domino queritur, sed propria (*ms. propia*). In patre igitur similitudo regis, in domino autem tyranni. Optimatum (*ms. optimarum*) vero similitudinem habet presidentia viri ad uxorem. Vir enim virtute et merito presidet et gubernat. Popularis autem inmagò cernitur in fratribus. Sunt enim pares inter se potestate et equalitate.

Nostre igitur rei publice gubernatio popularis est; que tertia species gubernandi legitima fuit a nobis superius nominata. Est eius fundamentum in paritate civium et equalitate, ut de fratribus supra similitudinem induximus. Leges igitur nostre omnes ad hoc unum tendunt, ut paritas sit et equalitas inter se civibus; in quo est mera ac vera libertas. Hinc est (quod) nos grandiores familias a rei publice guber-

---

was described in *Indici*, and by L. Bertalot in *Historische Vierteljahrsschrift*, XXIX (1934), 394, as an "oration of Bruni's to the emperor"—an error due possibly to the lack of an epistolary subscription. The following reproduction of the text is based on a photostat which Paul O. Kristeller, during a stay in Italy, secured for this writer; Prof. Kristeller has also very kindly helped in the reconstruction of the text by suggesting a number of emendations.

<sup>2</sup> Possibly non satis est quaerere?

natione repellimus, ne ille auctoritatem publicam nacte (*ms. nate*) in formidabiliorem evadant potentiam. Hinc est etiam quod maiores gravioresque pene contra nobilitatem constitute sunt, ut ex eodem maleficio aliter nobilis et potens condemnatur (*ms. condenetur*) et acrioribus penis afficiatur, quam plebeius aliquis et mediocris. Nituntur enim leges nostre supereminentiam singulorum civium quantum fieri potest deprimere et ad paritatem mediocritatemque reducere.

Summus apud nos magistratus duorum mensium spatio non amplius durat, ne inolescere illo homines vel superbire possint. Nec unus dumtaxat vir hunc magistratum optinet, sed sunt in eo cives numero novem. Horum unus vexillifer iustitiae, ceteri priores appellantur. Summuntur autem hii ex mediocri et parato ac frugi hominum genere. His attributi sunt in consilium duodecim boni viri, et vexilliferi societatum (*ms. sotietatem*) sedicim. Priores igitur cum his viginti (*ms. ingenti*) octo viris auctoritatem (*ms. auctoritate*) rei publice representant. Nec (*ms. Hec*) michi omnia possunt. Nam si quid gravius ordinandum est, ad consilia referatur oportet. Consilia vero civitatis duo sunt: unum populi, in quo circiter quadringenti viri existunt; alterum communis, quod est mistum ex nobilitate et plebe, pari fere numero cum superiori. Juri vero dicendo causisque civilibus magistratus alius praesidet cum potestate publica. Hic (*ms. His*) non est civis, sed peregrinus probatus aliquis et sapiens vir ad hoc ipsum a civitate delectus; ipsius officii tempus sex mensibus definitur. Est et alius magistratus qui dicitur capitaneus populi, cuius precipuum munus est iura populi tueri atque defendere. Est et alius magistratus, qui dicitur executor ordinamentorum iustitiae (*ms. iustitiae*), fere contra magnos et potentes oppositus. Hi tres magistratus, scilicet potestas, capitaneus et executor, non sunt cives, sed externi. Nec amplius sex mensibus durant. Et maleficia puniunt, et criminales iudicant lites; et finito officio examini subiacent civium; et si quid inique aut corrupte in officio suo iudicasse probantur, penas dant, et de suo proprio resarciunt, illis restituentes qui propter iniquam sententiam lesi fuerunt. In bellis autem (*ms. aut*) administrandis, quando (*ms. quanto*) illa civitati accidant, decem viri cives cum potestate publica creari solent. Hi ea possunt quae populus (*ms. populis*) universus. Neque enim expedit tunc secreta belli ad populum (*ms. apopulum*) referre. Appellatur autem hic magistratus vulgari quodam nomine decem balie. Qui tamen, si quid magni ponderis accidat, ad priores et eorum collegia et ampliorem numerum solent referre et consilium civium postulare.

Hi X viri per electionem constituuntur. At priores et XII boni viri et vexilliferi societatum non per electionem summuntur, sed per sortitionem. De quinquennio enim in quinquennium nomina probatorum civium certo examine sacculis includuntur; postea suo tempore sorte

nomina illa promuntur. Cui sors accidit, is est magistratus. Summuntur autem ex sacculis VIII priores et unus vexillifer (*ms. vesillifer*) iustitie et XII boni viri et XVI vexilliferi societatum; sed unum quodque istorum offitiorum suo tempore, et non simul omnia. Nam vexilliferis tempus est mensium quatuor, duodecim autem bonis viris tempus est mensium trium. Hi tres magistratus, scilicet priores, XII boni viri et XVI vexilliferi societatum, appellantur vulgo apud nos domini (et) collegae (*ms. collegi corr. ex collegia*); et auctoritatem publicam, ut diximus, representant.



## CHAPTER IX

### THE ANTI-FLORENTINE DISCOURSES OF THE DOGE TOMMASO MOCENIGO (1422-1423)

#### 1. AN APPARENT MONUMENT OF ANTI-FLORENTINISM IN THE EARLY QUATTROCENTO

The early 1420's saw a crucial transformation of Venetian politics in Italy. Up to then, relying on the protection of her lagoon, Venice had refrained from joining the struggle among the powers of the mainland. But soon after the death of the Doge Tommaso Mocenigo, she threw her full weight into the Italian power balance as an ally of Florence, thus saving the independence of the Florentine Republic and putting the copestone to the system of five major states that was to become the political pattern of the Peninsula.<sup>1</sup>

Our documentary evidence for the reversal of the leitmotifs in Venetian foreign policy is as exceptional as the events themselves. We have three speeches, attributed to Mocenigo, dating from the last years of his life, in which he defends the previous policy of isolation, maintains its soundness by revealing a wealth of data on Venice's commerce and finance, and indicates why a Florentinophile, interventionist school of diplomacy was rising among the younger generation.

But this unparalleled evidence from a Doge's pen has not come down to us in the form of archival documents. What we have is the version contained in an appendix to Marin Sanudo the

<sup>1</sup> See above "Introduction," pp. 7, 10, and "A Struggle for Liberty," pp. 559 ff.

younger's life of Mocenigo (in Sanudo's *Lives of the Doges* about 1490), written two generations after Mocenigo's death. The first two speeches are here identified as "some addresses made in answer to the ambassadors of the Florentines who were requesting the conclusion of a league with the Signoria [of Venice] against Duke Filippo Maria of Milan."<sup>2</sup> According to Sanudo's comment, the text was taken from the *Libro dell' Illustrre Messer Tommaso Mocenigo Doge di Venezia*, undoubtedly a copybook into which the records of the Doge had been transcribed. There follows a speech superscribed "Talk . . . of Tommaso Mocenigo Doge to a number of Senators while he was sick and in bed, shortly before he died."<sup>3</sup> This latter document has often been called Mocenigo's "political testament"; like the other two, it refers to the question of Venice's coöperation with Florence

<sup>2</sup> "Alcuni Arringhi fatti per dar risposta agli Ambasciatori de' Fiorentini, che richiedevano di far lega colla Signoria contro il Duca Filippo Maria di Milano." Marin Sanudo, *Le Vite dei Dogi*, in "Rerum Italicarum Scriptores," ed. Muratori (with the adapted title *Le Vite de' Duchi di Venezia*), tom. XXII (Milan, 1733), col. 946A. Mocenigo's *Vita*, with its documentary appendices, is in cols. 885-960. This is still the edition in which Sanudo's work must be consulted for the later periods, since the critical edition by G. Monticolo in the *Nuova Serie* of the "RIS" (1900-1911) has not progressed beyond the twelfth century. According to Monticolo's preface, Muratori's edition, prepared on the basis of a copy in Modena, is marred by many lacunae, misreadings, and modernizations of the language, as is seen from a comparison with Sanudo's autograph copy in the manuscripts cl. VII Ital. N. 800 and 801 of the Biblioteca Marciana. But Muratori's omission of facts of vital importance belongs mostly to the period after Tommaso Mocenigo (according to Monticolo's preface p. 2, line 5); and many of the statistical data contained in the second discourse are available in a transcription from Sanudo's autograph published in the *Bilanci Generali della Repubblica di Venezia*, vol. I, tom. I (Venice, 1912; ed. L. Luzzatti for the "Commissione per la Pubblicazione dei Documenti Finanziari della Repubblica di Venezia"), pp. 577-580. For a reëdition of the third discourse, see below, note 4.

<sup>3</sup> "Parlare del Serenissimo Messer Tommaso Mocenigo Doge ad alcuni Senatori, essendo in letto ammalato, poco avanti ch'egli morisse." Muratori, "Rerum Italicarum Scriptores," tom. XXII, col. 958D. In a version preserved outside Sanudo's *Vite* and reproduced in the *Bilanci Generali* (see below note 4) this superscription reads "Renga de messer Thomado Mocenigo doxe alla Signoria, sentendose esser per grave malatia vegnudo alla fin de la sua vita."

against Filippo Maria Visconti and may be assumed to have come from the same copybook.

One may wonder, of course, whether Sanudo's reference to such a source is reliable, but there are several reasons for confidence. In the first place, consultation of varied kinds of original materials such as this is a strong point of all of Sanudo's writings. Furthermore, the same speeches with the attribution to Mocenigo are also found in some Venetian chronicles and manuscripts contemporaneous with, or even somewhat older than Sanudo. Although there are differences in the readings and in some factual details, the other versions are in substance identical with the text set forth in Sanudo's *Vite*.<sup>4</sup> Finally, the precise statistics of early Quattrocento finance and production contained in the second and the third document cannot have been but drawn from contemporary official sources.<sup>5</sup>

Under these circumstances, historians since Burckhardt — general,<sup>6</sup> economic,<sup>7</sup> and literary<sup>8</sup> alike — have felt entitled to rely

<sup>4</sup> Reference to these other versions, and to the fact of their superiority in many details to the version handed down by Sanudo, was made as early as 1855 by S. Romanin, *Storia Documentata di Venezia*, IV (Venice, 1855), 92, 95 n. 1, 486. See also the more recent comments on these variants by H. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte von Venedig*, II (Gotha, 1920), 542, 617, 619, and L. Luzzatti, *Bilanci Generali*, pp. 97 n. 1, 580 n. 1. In the form preserved in the *Cronaca Dolfina* (in the manuscript cl. VII N. 794 of the Biblioteca Marciana), the third discourse was reedited by Luzzatti in *Bilanci Generali*, pp. 94-97, and reprinted from Luzzatti's edition in Kretschmayr's *Geschichte*, II, 617-619.

<sup>5</sup> G. Luzzatto, in his well-known study "Sull'attendibilità di alcune statistiche economiche medievali," *Giornale degli Economisti*, ser. IV, vol. LXIX (1929), by comparing other available information, succeeded in some cases in proving the accuracy, and in other cases in proving at least the probability, of Mocenigo's figures. This does not exclude mistakes in details, as Luzzatto pointed out; one must also be on guard against the errors of copyists, as has been demonstrated in some interesting instances by Luzzatti in *Bilanci Generali*, pp. 577-579, notes.

<sup>6</sup> J. Burckhardt, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien*, ed. W. Goetz (Stuttgart, 1922), p. 54; Romanin, *Storia Documentata di Venezia*, IV, 92, 95, 486 f.; Kretschmayr, *Geschichte von Venedig*, II, 279 f., 617-619; R. Cessi, *Storia della Repubblica di Venezia*, I (1944), 362-364; C. Barbagnallo, *Storia Universale*, III 2 (Turin, 1935; new ed. 1952), 1088-1090.

<sup>7</sup> See Luzzatto's critical discussion quoted above, note 5, and general works like R. von Pöhlmann, *Die Wirtschaftspolitik der Florentiner Renaissance*.

on this unparalleled evidence for their reconstructions of the early Renaissance, even though they knew that the text in all preserved versions shows unmistakable traces of adulterations after Mocenigo's death. They thought it necessary, to be sure, to note that a number of dates and facts referred to in the speeches are wrong; or that there is mention of events that occurred after Mocenigo had died; or that some sections are characterized by a rhetorical hue and a delight in biblical citations that would not be easily expected from a Doge in a public address. But once such over-all statements had been made, every user has felt at liberty to refer to that part of the information which suited him as the "substantial" and reliable core of the documents.

This lack of critical precision may do no real harm as long as interest is limited to the economic data; for the statistical figures in the speeches, though not necessarily infallible, stand out as a body of information that clearly could have been available only to a statesman in a key position in Mocenigo's own day. But when our interest turns to the political program advocated in the speeches, a vague awareness of later adaptations will not reveal to us the Doge's genuine views; nor will it help us in answering the decisive question: why did Mocenigo oppose coöperation with Florence? In the second speech, his opposition is not only based on careful economic statistics, but also springs from a vehemently expressed hatred against Florence, "the vilest Commune in Italy."<sup>9</sup> Again, in the first speech, Florence, and not Filippo Maria Visconti, is depicted as greedy for expansion and responsible for the war between Florence and Milan; we even are told that the Florentines had decreed the penalty of death for anyone recommending reconciliation. Was this violently biased way of looking at Florence an aspect of Mocenigo's atti-

---

*sance und das Princip der Verkehrsfreiheit* (Leipzig, 1878), p. 131; A. Doren, *Italienische Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Jena, 1934), pp. 547, 635, 670, 681; P. Bonfante, *Lezioni di storia del commercio*, I (Rome, 1933), 231, 235; J. W. Thompson, *Economic and Social History of Europe in the Later Middle Ages 1300-1530* (New York, 1931), pp. 273, 459 f.

<sup>9</sup> Rossi, *Il Quattrocento* (see Chapter IX, section 5, note 2).

<sup>10</sup> "la più vile Comunità d'Italia." Sanudo, ed. Muratori, col. 952A.

tude? <sup>10</sup> It is attested by no other source. Our whole appraisal of the Florentine-Venetian relations in the early Quattrocento will be different according to whether the Doge really expressed so bitter an antipathy, to go along with his economic argument, or whether this hatred should be ascribed to that later period when Mocenigo's documents were adapted by a redactor.

In an attempt, however, to establish a neat distinction between what is genuine and what interpolated in the three discourses, we must once more apply the basic methods followed in this book — tracing as accurately as possible the situation in the background, judging all details in the light of the political outlook and temper of the author, and reconstructing the perspective from which he viewed the past events and lined them up with the experience of his own time.<sup>11</sup>

## 2. A RECONSTRUCTION OF A PERVERTED CHRONOLOGY

In searching for a weak spot in the façade erected by the later adapter of Mocenigo's speeches, we presently become aware of a confusion surrounding everything connected with the dates of the alleged dogal documents. This does not apply to the third piece, to be sure. For the last address, according to the opening editorial note, came from the time of the Doge's last illness shortly before he died <sup>1</sup> — information which we have no reason to doubt. But the chronology of the first and second discourse demands careful examination.

The introductory paragraph of the first discourse runs as follows. "This is a copy from the *Libro dell' Illustré Messer Tommaso Mocenigo Doge di Venezia* of a few addresses made in

<sup>10</sup> This is what Barbagallo believes, according to a note in his just cited important appraisal of the speeches (see above, note 6). These speeches show among other things, he states, that, in the time after the Florentine conquest of Pisa, a Venetian speaker could say that "la più vile Comunità d'Italia" had humiliated one of the two great Tyrrhenian republics which had been glorious before Florence in their history. (*Storia Universale*. III 2, 1092.)

<sup>11</sup> For the use of these methods in previous chapters, compare pp. 31 ff., 49 f., 56 ff., 66 ff., 83 ff., 87 ff., 93 above.

<sup>1</sup> See Chapter IX, section 1, note 3.

answer to the ambassadors of the Florentines. . . . The first in the year 1420 A.D., in the month of January. 'Illustrious Senators. The Commonwealth of Florence has had it explained to us through her ambassadors. . . .' "<sup>2</sup> Since, obviously, the year is understood *stilo Veneto* (beginning the year with March 1), this means January 1421.

The second discourse is dated in its first sentence July 1421. "In 1421, during the month of July, the said ambassadors finally received a reply from Florence; they were told [by the Florentine government] that it was necessary for them to obey the law [enjoining them not to talk peace], if they did not want to be decapitated. So the *Consiglio de' Pregadi* was summoned . . ." for discussion as well as voting on the Florentine proposal, and the Doge began to speak. "Our young Procurator, Ser Francesco Foscari, . . . has told us from the platform everything the Florentines have set forth. . . ." <sup>3</sup>

If accepted at face value, therefore, the two first speeches belong to times and conditions rather remote from those of the third. For, while they are thus dated January and July 1421, respectively, the third one, dating shortly before Mocenigo's death, must have originated in the last days of March or the first few days of April 1423. This, in fact, is the chronology which has been usually assumed,<sup>4</sup> and has never been critically challenged.

<sup>2</sup> "Questa è una copia tratta dal Libro dell' Illustre Messer Tommaso Mocenigo Doge di Venezia, d'alcuni arringhi fatti per dar risposta agli Ambasciatori de' Fiorentini, chi richiedevano di far lega colla Signoria contro il Duca Filippo Maria di Milano. La prima negli Anni di Cristo 1420. del mese di Gennajo. 'Illustre Consiglio. La Comunità di Firenze ci ha fatto esporre pe' suoi Ambasciatori. . . .' " Sanudo, ed. Muratori, col. 946A.

<sup>3</sup> "Del 1421. del mese di Luglio i detti Ambasciatori dipoi ebbero risposta da Firenze, la quale diceva loro, che conveniva di servare la legge, per non esser loro troncato il collo. E fu chiamato il Consiglio de' Pregadi. . . 'Pel montare del nostro Procuratore giovane Ser Francesco Foscari . . . , ha detto sopra l'arringo tutto quello, che i Fiorentini hanno esposto. . . .' " Col. 949B.

<sup>4</sup> Kretschmayr, *Geschichte von Venedig*, II, 279 f., 619 ("Im Jaenner und anscheinend im Spaetsommer 1421 und wieder im Frühjahr 1423 . . .");

Yet some remarks of the Doge in the second discourse are irreconcilable with these datings. This is what Mocenigo is there quoted as saying about the arrival of Florentine delegations at Venice. "In 1422, during the month of January [that is, 1423 of the common style], the aforementioned Florentines sent their ambassadors to this country. These put before us a statement of the same facts that they had first pointed out in July 1421. . . . Subsequently we made a speech."<sup>5</sup>

Here the delegation of July 1421 is said to have been the first, whereas a delegation arriving in January is ascribed to the year 1423. Also, the passage "In 1423 [common style], during the month of January, . . . they sent their ambassadors. . . . These put before us a statement. . . . Subsequently we made a speech [which is recapitulated in its essential parts]" refers to a past event, implying that Mocenigo's present speech (that is, the second of the three handed to us) was made some time after January 1423.

We hit upon other patent contradictions. The quoted reference to the Florentine delegations of July 1421 and January 1423 is linked to the words "we want to answer in the same manner in which we talked a year ago" — an allusion to a past event, repeated later in a second mention of the answer given "a year ago."<sup>6</sup> This past event cannot be the stay of the delegation of July 1421. As the Doge's speech is represented as subsequent to the arrival of another delegation from Florence which was present in January 1423, the interval of time since July 1421 is more than eighteen months; it would be impossible in the spring of

---

Doren, *Italienische Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, p. 670 ("Leidenschaftlicher . . . spricht 1421 der Doge Mocenigo zu seinen Venezianer Mitbuergern"); Barbagallo, *Storia Universale*, III 2, 1089 (" . . . il discorso del Luglio 1421"); Rossi, *Il Quattrocento*, 3. ed., p. 152.

<sup>5</sup>"Del 1422. del mese di Gennajo i detti Fiorentini mandarono i loro Ambasciadori in questa Terra. I quali esposero quelle medesime cose, che pe' primi furono esposte del 1421. di Luglio . . . Poi parlammo." Col. 955E-956A.

<sup>6</sup>"Quello che dicemmo da ora ad un' anno, di nuovo repichiamolo." " . . . dar risposta a' Fiorentini, come noi facemmo già un' anno." Col. 955E, line 69; col. 957B, line 30.

1423 or later for the Doge to call an address of July 1421 a speech made "a year ago." Nor can that speech be identical with the Doge's answer to the Florentine delegates of January 1423; for a year after their stay at Venice, Mocenigo, who died April 4, 1423, had been dead for nine months.

One would expect Sanudo, in transcribing these documents, to become aware of such wild confusion. In fact, in his *Vita* of Mocenigo he puts forward his own, again entirely different interpretation of the time and background of the evidence reproduced from the Doge's copybook. "In 1423, two distinguished ambassadors of the Florentines arrived in this country, the one a *cavaliere* and the other a doctor. These expounded before the *Signoria* the thesis that it appeared that the Duke of Milan wished to make himself Lord and King of Italy. Therefore, they wished to conclude an alliance against him; and they disclosed that their commission was to go and see the Emperor Sigismund, King of Hungary, to put the same request to him. For this reason there were several disputes in the *Consiglio de' Pregadi*. Some wished to conclude the alliance, like Francesco Foscari *Procuratore*; but the Doge did not agree and made a speech. Therefore one finds an address of his written on this matter. Eventually they [the ambassadors] received an answer."<sup>7</sup>

In other words, Sanudo accepted from the copybook documents merely that some discussions had gone on before the Venetian government toward the end of Mocenigo's regime, early in 1423. On the other hand, the incidents which Sanudo describes show that he had knowledge of additional source material. For he relates details not mentioned in the three speeches — that the "distinguished ambassadors" then sent to Venice were

<sup>7</sup>"Nel 1423. giunsero in questa Terra due solenni Ambasciatori de' Fiorentini, l'uno Cavaliere, l'altro Dottore, i quali sposero alla Signoria, come il Duca di Milano, a quello che si vedeva, volevasi far Signore e Re d'Italia. Però voleano far lega contro di lui, e che hanno in commessione d'andare all'Imperadore Sigismundo Re d'Ungheria, richiendolo *etiam* di questo. Onde nel Consiglio de' Pregadi furono fatte varie dispute. Chi voleva far lega, come fu Francesco Foscari *Procuratore*; ma il Doge non consentiva, e parlò; onde si truova la sua aringa scritta su di questa materia. Alla fine gli fu risposto," Sanudo, col. 945C.



one "*cavaliere*" and one "doctor," and that these envoys had also been commissioned to visit the Emperor and ask him for a league. Does this reconstruction of the events by the late-Quattrocento historian point the way to the historical truth?

We have the Florentine official documents on a delegation to Venice in 1423. They have been preserved in that treasure chest of diplomatic information on Florence's early Quattrocento politics, the letters and reports of Rinaldo degli Albizzi from his diplomatic missions.<sup>8</sup> Here we find evidence that in fact "two ambassadors, the one a *cavaliere* and the other a doctor," were sent to Venice in that year with the commission to continue their journey from Venice to the Emperor Sigismund; and that they were Rinaldo degli Albizzi, *cavaliere*, and Alessandro di Salvi, *dottore di legge*. But these ambassadors were in Venice during the last week of March, not in January as would appear from what Mocenigo is made to say in the copybook document. More important, their official instruction and their own reports on the happenings during their stay in Venice refute some crucial points of Sanudo's conjectures. Among other things, they disclose that Mocenigo had already fallen ill and was in bed on March 30 when the Florentine delegates delivered their message to the *Signoria*. On the following day, Albizzi expressly informed the Florentine government in a letter that sickness had prevented the Doge from being present at the reception, and this fact is mentioned again in Albizzi's final report on the activities of the ambassadors.<sup>9</sup> Since Mocenigo remained confined to his sickbed until his death on April 4, he cannot ever have addressed the Council on matters proposed by the March-April delegation.

Also, we learn from the Florentine documents that definitely no request for a league was put forward on that occasion. The only business discussed by the ambassadors was Florence's offer of a diplomatic effort to bring about a reconciliation between

<sup>8</sup> *Commissioni di Rinaldo degli Albizzi per il Comune di Firenze dal MCCCXCIX al MCCCXXXIII*, ed. C. Guasti in the series *Documenti di Storia Italiana*, 3 vols. (Florence, 1867-1873), henceforth cited as *Commissioni*. See vol. I, pp. 384-398.

<sup>9</sup> *Commissioni*, I, 394, 398.

Venice and King Sigismund in their quarrel regarding Friuli and Dalmatia — a quarrel that had been going on for years and had brought on an alliance between Venice and Milan, both of which were equally interested in challenging Sigismund's claims. Consequently, the only matter on which the Venetian government had to pass a decision at that time was the offer of Florentine mediation, although this offer, no doubt, had been made with the intent of rendering Venice independent of Filippo Maria's assistance, and free to reconsider her position toward Milan and Florence. The answer of the Venetian Senate to the envoys did not, in fact, touch on the problems of a league. It consisted only of a polite rejection of Florentine mediation; the reason given was that in view of Sigismund's previous conduct success was too improbable, and that unsuccessful negotiations behind Filippo Maria's back would harm the existing Venetian understanding with Milan. For the rest, Florence was assured that Venice's coöperation with the Visconti was not in the nature of a "general" alliance, but restricted to their common action against the Emperor in north-eastern Italy.<sup>10</sup>

The visit of the Florentine ambassadors in 1423, therefore, cannot have furnished the setting for the speeches as we have them. In the preceding years, however, according to what is known from the archival documents, no Florentine delegation had been in Venice for the purpose of negotiating political coöperation between the two republics. For, although the Florentine diplomatic correspondence of the early 1420's is only incompletely preserved, it can be supplemented with some references found in the Venetian *Secreta Senatus*, an archival series which, though unpublished, has been repeatedly examined for the history of the Venetian-Florentine relations.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> *Commissioni*, I, 394 f., 398. Only the Florentine proposal of mediation between Venice and Sigismund (and no offer of a Florentine alliance) is mentioned also in the Venetian documents for 1423 referred to in our following note.

<sup>11</sup> Used by Romanin, *Storia Documentata di Venezia*, IV, 91, and again by F. Raulich, "La prima guerra fra i Veneziani e Filippo Maria Visconti," *Rivista Storica Italiana*, V (1888), 443.

The bits of information that can be culled from these sources show that as late as October and November 1421 Florence had been engaged in efforts to meet the growing danger from the north by finding a counterpoise in Naples, the potential southern rival to the plans of the Visconti for predominance in Italy. From reports of Florentine envoys to Naples, who paid visits to Pope Martin V on their way through Rome, we learn that it was the Pope who, at that time, in the interest of the defense of Bologna urged Florence and Venice to form a league against Filippo Maria "*per utilità d'Italia*." Martin, in fact, had previously sent an ambassador to Florence to work for an alliance between the two republics, and late in 1421 he deplored the fact that Florence had not entered upon this best course for Italy's deliverance from danger.<sup>12</sup> It was not until May 1422 that Florence decided to explore the attitude of Venice, and even then did not proceed openly by sending ambassadors, but made an indirect inquiry through one of the north-Italian princes threatened by the Milanese advance. As we find in the Venetian *Secreta Senatus*, the Marquis of Mantua approached the Doge in May 1422 with the news that Florence was anxious to establish a league with Venice. The reply was that the Doge would take the matter to the *Consiglio*; and when the Marquis inquired again later he was told this was an important matter, and Florence had better explain her request directly and in detail.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> See the several dispatches published in *Commissioni*, I, 321 f. Rinaldo degli Albizzi reported on October 12, 1421 that the Pope "*desidera, che la vostra Signoria s'intenda appieno co' Viniziani; chè per questa via sperebbe ogni pericolo si cessasse*"; and on November 9, the Pope complained to a Florentine, Lionardo Dati, "*che se i Fiorentini avessono fatto quello di che gli fece pregare per l'Abate di Mantova, mio ambasciadore, di concordarsi con Viniziani in nella difesa di Bologna,*" he should not now need to engage in difficult diplomatic actions.

<sup>13</sup> In the passages in the *Secreta Senatus* noted by Romanin and Raulich (see above note 11). Or could it be that the "*Marchese di Mantova*," named at these points in the *Secreta* (according to Romanin and Raulich), actually was the "*Abate di Mantova*" referred to in note 12? In other words, could it be that Florence in May 1422 made her indirect inquiry through the Papal ambassador who in the preceding autumn had urged that political course? Even if this supposition should ever prove to be right, it would

These facts, together with what we have just learnt about the happenings in March–April 1423, allow us to reconstruct the course of events. First, as long as Mocenigo lived there was no direct request by Florentine ambassadors for an alliance; and, consequently, the Doge did not make a speech recommending a reply to waiting Florentine envoys. Second, since Florence failed to follow up her indirect soundings of May 1422<sup>14</sup> and ten months later merely offered diplomatic mediation in Venice's quarrels with the Emperor, we may infer that the news leaking out about the reception of Florence's soundings had been so discouraging as to make the Florentine government feel that a direct appeal for military assistance would involve too great a risk. This adverse news can hardly have been anything else but information on the Doge's opposition to the plans of the Foscari group. This means, any statement Mocenigo may have made on the question of the league, must have come forth in the period which immediately followed the inquiry of the Mantuan Marquis — that is, during the summer or autumn of 1422.

But no memorandum (or draft for a speech) then composed can have included references to a Florentine delegation waiting for a reply. In other words, not merely the dubious story that the Florentine envoys were unable to talk peace on reasonable terms on account of an unreasonable law, but every passage presupposing a Florentine delegation waiting for a reply in matters of the league must have been forged and inserted into Mocenigo's records. The contradictions in our information about the time when the Florentine envoys appeared in Venice are thus explained by the discovery that the event itself is a fictitious one. The only satisfactory conclusion is the following. The papers left by the Doge Mocenigo at his death included, in addition to his

---

not injure our above conclusions; for, even in this event, Florence would not have sent any ambassadors to Venice in 1422, but would have made her soundings through the agency of a non-Florentine mediator.

<sup>14</sup>Romanin, on the basis of his examination of the Venetian documents, expressly states that nothing further happened at that time. *Storia Documentata*, IV, 91.

deathbed speech, a draft for an address before the *Consiglio* in or shortly after May 1422, intended to reject suggestions of the Foscari group. It was the redactor, or rather forger, who at a later time (perhaps recalling Albizzi's and Salvi's mission in March-April 1423, as well as subsequent delegations) placed Mocenigo's plea into the frame of an invented story of the repeated arrival of Florentine ambassadors sent to accomplish the conclusion of a league.

The forger may have made his insertions partly in order to dramatize the events; but at the same time his fraud served the purpose of shedding a sinister light on the intentions and the behavior of the Florentines, as later observations will disclose. At this moment the most important consequence of our observation is that we can substantially extend the range of the criteria by which to tell the forgery from the genuine core. The following rules can safely be accepted: we may expect to discover the handwriting of the redactor wherever reference is made to a Florentine delegation in matters of the league; wherever the errors with regard to dates or facts show a degree of ignorance improbable with a Venetian Doge; wherever events belonging to the period after Mocenigo's death are noted; and wherever we encounter the mixture of rhetoric and abundant biblical quotations that is characteristic of certain portions of the speeches and inconsistent with an address read before the *Consiglio de' Pregadi*. On the other hand, we may expect to have before us a section from Mocenigo's original draft wherever we meet the accurate statistical figures that presuppose the knowledge of a statesman in a top position with full access to the administrative information.

Are these criteria sufficiently precise as to sift the chaff from the wheat in the alleged dogal discourses?

### 3. THE THREE DISCOURSES AS A PARTIAL FORGERY

When we begin to read the first of the addresses attributed to Mocenigo,<sup>1</sup> we find ourselves immediately confronted with the

<sup>1</sup> Sanudo, ed. Muratori, col. 946-949.

story of Florentine envoys waiting for a decision on their request for a league. "The Commonwealth of Florence has had it explained to us *through her ambassadors* . . ." — these are the words with which the Doge opens his address before the Venetian Senate.<sup>2</sup> It is true, the alleged exposé of the envoys as summarized by the Doge provides an historically adroit analysis of the effects of Filippo Maria's expansionist policy on the Italian equilibrium in the early 1420's. If Florence's power for resistance should be crushed (the envoys are quoted as having argued), this would entail Milanese rule through all the rest of central and northern Italy; even Venice, if left alone, would share the fate of the other Italian states.<sup>3</sup> One would be only too glad if this analysis could be used for drawing the picture of the Florentine political outlook in the summer of 1422. But as the alleged Florentine views stem from fictitious envoys and Mocenigo's subsequent counter-opinion is addressed to the same imaginary "*ambasciatori Fiorentini*," neither can be accepted as genuine.

As to the contents of the alleged opinion of the Doge, it is essentially a historical survey of the events which, in the Doge's eyes, had brought about Florence's plight; a survey bristling with violent condemnation of the Florentine actions. Now it is just this historical sketch in which we find every statement of fact to be a blunder. The stipulation of a demarcation line between the Milanese and the Florentine spheres of interest, which had been agreed upon in 1420, is attributed to the year 1412 when Filippo Maria had hardly begun to reestablish the Visconti regime after the decay following Giangaleazzo's death in 1402;<sup>4</sup> and the appointment of the first "Ten Men" (*Dieci di Balìa*) for the preparation of the war against Filippo Maria in the spring of 1423 is said to have taken place in 1415.<sup>5</sup> These and other similar blunders are too grave to be dismissed as slips of a copyist; on the other hand, it is impossible that the Doge of Venice should have held

<sup>2</sup> See Chapter IX, section 2, note 2.

<sup>3</sup> Col. 946A-B.

<sup>4</sup> Col. 946E.

<sup>5</sup> Col. 948D.

so distorted a view of the chronology of Italian inter-state politics during his own regime.

If we assumed for a moment that Mocenigo was responsible for the errors in this discourse, he would have been entirely misinformed not only about dates, but also about the facts themselves. For instance, he would have had a completely mistaken idea of the actions of one of the leading Florentine statesmen of his generation. According to the first discourse, Niccolò da Uzzano (next to Maso degli Albizzi the most influential leader of the ruling Florentine group) was a peace-minded sage who in the decisive hour eloquently depicted the misery which follows every war, and tried to dissuade his countrymen from any military intercession with the assertion that in his eyes the treaty on a demarkation line did not forbid Filippo Maria the extension of his rule into Romagna (the explosive event early in 1423). It was contrary to this sound advice (Mocenigo is presented as saying) that the warmongering majority in the Florentine government took the Romagna quarrels as the pretext for war.<sup>6</sup> We still have in the Florentine archives the original documents which prove that Uzzano had been one of the champions of a determined stand and of warlike action in the periods when Giangaleazzo Visconti and King Ladislaus of Naples (the latter in 1411-14) had pursued a course of expansion similar to that of Filippo Maria after 1420.<sup>7</sup> That Uzzano's attitude was not changed in the early 1420's is proved by the fact that on May 19, 1423 he made in a *consulta* one of the speeches responsible for Florence's military precautions for the fight. In this speech he did not warn against war, but urged action before Filippo Maria had occupied the whole of

<sup>6</sup> Col. 947C, 948A.

<sup>7</sup> The material has been collected by Amelia Dainelli, "Niccolò da Uzzano nella vita politica dei suoi tempi," *Archivio Storico Italiano* 1932, Ser. VII, vol. XVII. See in particular pp. 49-62 on Uzzano's tireless activities in the war against Giangaleazzo, pp. 72 ff. on Uzzano's attitude in the time of Ladislaus, and p. 82 with extracts from his speech June 4, 1414, in which he opposed acceptance of the compromise peace offered by Ladislaus and advised: by resisting and defending liberty "evitabimus dedecus et infamiam nostram," "non sumus in tanta extremitate quod pacem ut petit firmemus."

northern Italy and thus regained the superiority once possessed by Giangaleazzo.<sup>8</sup>

Mocenigo's alleged account of the Milanese occupation of Forlì in the Romagna (placed in 1414 instead of 1423) turns the actual course of events upside down in a similarly fantastic manner. The narrative is here spiced with entirely imaginary episodes of temporary withdrawals of the Milanese troops, such as would suggest Filippo's good will and Florence's recklessness.<sup>9</sup>

Not only do contentions like these reveal a degree of misrepresentation that is incredible from the mouth of the Doge speaking before a body of the best-informed diplomats, but a number of the incidents mentioned had not yet happened in 1422, and did not happen at all in Mocenigo's lifetime. When Forlì was occupied by Milanese troops in the middle of May 1423, Mocenigo had been in his grave for about six weeks; the *consulta* in which Uzzano stepped forth as a decisive speaker did not take place until May 19. In addition, we find in the discourse many allusions to serious Florentine defeats, although there was no adverse turn of the war for Florence until late in July 1424.

All these distorted or anachronistic episodes throughout the speech are made to serve the final argument: that Florence not only had become involved in the war by her own choosing, but had made a law threatening anyone with decapitation who talked of peace.<sup>10</sup> This is a contention which sets the tenor of the entire discourse; for since it means that the Florentine envoys are unable honestly to negotiate for peace, the Doge can finally be represented as proposing (with the approval of the Senate) that the envoys should be asked to write home and demand exemption from their dismal law. When the answer, after a few months, is negative, the Doge is made to launch his second and even more violently anti-Florentine attack.

Such is the one of the documents which, at least in part, is

<sup>8</sup> *Commissioni*, I, 413. Uzzano also advised determined war action in the following year, on August 3, 1424; see *Commissioni*, II, 147.

<sup>9</sup> Sanudo, col. 947A-B, 948D-E.

<sup>10</sup> Col. 948B-C.



considered an historical testimony from Mocenigo's period. Against the background of the knowledge that no Florentine delegation ever appeared in Venice in Mocenigo's lifetime for negotiation about a league, it is evident that this is not a source on which we may depend, not even after allowance has been made for mistakes of the author and for later adaptations by the redactor. It is a totally fictitious product, composed after Mocenigo's death, and forged in order to set the stage for the subsequent address.

The second document from Mocenigo's copybook is introduced with the editorial comment that a negative reply has arrived from Florence. In conjunction with the chronological statement that July has come,<sup>11</sup> this means that the Florentine government is supposed to have left the January inquiry of their ambassadors unanswered for six months — a most incredible procrastination.

The Doge starts his new address with a fresh argument. He does not refer, as one would expect, to the Florentine decision that allegedly had just arrived, but complains that "our young Procurator, Ser Francesco Foscari," is championing an alliance with Florence. "He has said," the Doge explains, "that it is advisable to give aid to the Florentines on the ground that their weal is also our weal, and, consequently, harm to them is harm to us." However, the refutation of this challenge does not follow at once. It is postponed until later — in "due time and place we shall give our answer on this matter."<sup>12</sup>

For the moment, the Doge plunges into a theological sermon of about 1700 words, a speech not on the rights or wrongs of Foscari's proposition, but on every man's moral and religious duty not to attack his neighbor or to go to war.<sup>13</sup> In the eyes of the speaker, the state that has been the aggressor and now burns with the desire for reckless expansion is Florence, "which delights in

<sup>11</sup> See above, p. 190.

<sup>12</sup> "Egli disse, ch'egli è buono lo soccorrere a' Fiorentini, a ragione che il loro bene è il nostro, e per conseguente il loro male è il nostro." "A tempo e a luogo gli risponderemo a proposito." Col. 949C.

<sup>13</sup> From col. 949C, line 37, to col. 952B, line 25.

grabbing the territory and property of others for herself.”<sup>14</sup> But woe betide; whoever craves his neighbor’s goods will lose his own. “Precisely this has occurred in Florence at present because the Florentines have desired what belongs to others. The land and the fortifications which were theirs are being given to the Duke.”<sup>15</sup> Thus it has happened in the past to every people that wanted war; thus it will happen to Venice if she should embark on alliances for war. Pisa grew great and prosperous through peace. “As it began to crave war and the property of others, it sank into poverty, and the Duke [of Milan] caused the citizens to be divided among themselves, and tyrants (*signori*) emerged. One expelled the other, until they became subject to the vilest Commune in Italy, that is, Florence.”<sup>16</sup>

It would be improbable even at times of great tension that a Doge before the assembled Senate should have called Florence “the vilest Commune in Italy”; it is impossible at a moment when common danger was drawing the two republics together in many ways. It is equally unbelievable that a Doge of Venice should have talked of Pisa in such naïve and distorted terms and found peacefulness in the time of Pisa’s great expansion, bellicosity in the days of her military prostration. Moreover, is it possible that a Venetian Doge should have prefaced his decision on whether or not to enter into a league with Florence with the meditation that “God created the Angels, made their nature,” rewarded the good, and punished the evil? Or that a Doge in a speech before the Senate should have ranged through the Old Testament, from Adam to Cain, to Noah, and on to Christ and the New Testament, in order to find appropriate examples of peace, and of punishment for the warmakers? Finally, although in a sermon of this kind there is little room for anachronistic statements that would betray the hand of a forger, the latter has left his mark on one occasion.

<sup>14</sup> “. . . la quale ha piacere di togliere le terre altrui e la roba per loro.”

<sup>15</sup> “Così è avvenuto a’ Fiorentini al presente per desiderare quel d’altri. Le Terre e i Castelli, che furono suoi, si danno al Duca.”

<sup>16</sup> “Come desiderò quel d’altri, in far guerra, s’impoverì, e il Duca divise i Cittadini, che si faceano Signori. Uno cacciava l’altro, a tanto che le più vile Comunità d’Italia li sortomise, che fu Firenze.”

For we hear that "this country has had its own government for 1008 years" ("*questa Terra ha regnato 1008 anni*").<sup>17</sup> Since Venice, according to the generally accepted traditional story, was founded in 421, this takes us well into the time after Tommaso Mocenigo's death.

After the reference to Pisa there is a break in the context. What has been said with regard to Pisa, the Doge goes on, is true of any other city. "Consequently, you, Ser Francesco Foscari, our young Procurator, should never talk from the platform [in council meetings] as you have done, unless you have previously acquired good understanding and good practice."<sup>18</sup> What is the "good understanding and good practice" Foscari should acquire before recommending an alliance with Florence? Is it the knowledge that those who waged unjust wars have always perished? Reading on, one realizes that the true lesson in realism to be learned by the younger statesman is still to come. Except for the copula "consequently" in the beginning, the quoted passage is actually the introduction to a fresh discussion<sup>19</sup> which does not have the slightest relationship to the preceding denunciation of the iniquity of Florence's war. On the contrary, it takes for granted that the point in question is not Florence's desire for conquests, but the grave danger that she might lose her independence to the Visconti. In that case, may Venice look on quietly and without overwhelming peril to herself? The facts which should dictate the answer, the Doge submits, are these: that Venice's interest demands good relations only with north-Italian neighbor-states, including Genoa because it is under Filippo Maria's rule, but need not take into consideration faraway Florence; that the hills of the Veronese territory and the Adige river (the present Venetian frontiers) form a natural barrier in the west, easily defended if Milan should ever try to attack; that, furthermore, if Florence lost her liberty, some of her industries would move to free Venice, making Flor-

<sup>17</sup> Col. 951B.

<sup>18</sup> "Adunque voi Ser Francesco Foscari nostro Procurator giovane non parlate mai sopra gli arringhi nel modo ch'avete fatto, se prima non avete buona intelligenza e buona pratica." Col. 952B.

<sup>19</sup> Col. 952B, lines 25 ff.

ence's loss of liberty a blessing in disguise; and, finally, that the territory of the Visconti was so essential for Venice's prosperity, by providing food and raw materials and by using a large share of the Venetian trade, that Venice must never allow a war to be waged against Milan and devastate the "garden" of Venice. To prove these points, the vast statistical information is set forth that has made this discourse (in addition to the third, the deathbed address) famous as a source for economic history.

Here, then, we have an adequate and concrete answer to Foscari's claim that Florence's fate was Venice's concern. And in this section we meet with chronological indications which prove that we are not now looking at the Italian scene of "1008 years after 421." For, in the statistical survey, just mentioned, of the Venetian exchange with Milan it is taken for granted that Verona is the westernmost city in the Venetian State, whereas Brescia and Bergamo are Milanese possessions.<sup>20</sup> Brescia and Bergamo, however, were occupied by Venice in 1426-27 and tenaciously kept under Venetian rule ever since.

Given these differences between the introductory section and the subsequent part,<sup>21</sup> the nature of the second discourse is revealed as clearly as was that of the preceding document. In the second discourse we have before us the original draft of a speech of the Doge, although adulterated by one or, possibly, more compact insertions. What the redactor had found in Mocenigo's papers was essentially an economic and statistical refutation of the soundness of Foscari's plea for helping Florence. To this exposé of the Doge, the redactor joined in the first place the argument, already ventilated in the forged first address, that Venice should not ally herself with Florence because the Florentines were guilty of beginning the war (which had become reality by the time of the redactor's manipulations), and also because religion and ethics demand the preservation of peace regardless of the circumstances. After a brief initial reproduction of Foscari's thesis, therefore,

<sup>20</sup> Col. 952C, 953E, 954A. The same references are found in the version published from Sanudo's autograph copy in *Bilanci Generali*, p. 578.

<sup>21</sup> Col. 949C, line 37 — col. 952B, line 25; col. 952B, lines 25 ff.

the redactor inserted the sections which, from his viewpoint, were missing in Mocenigo's reasoning. After this had been done, the original comment of the Doge could be left essentially untouched through several pages of the text.

That the forger made no substantial alterations in these latter pages<sup>22</sup> is suggested by the lack of any reference to Florence's alleged war guilt, or to the presence of Florentine envoys in Venice. Instead, the argument is consistently built on data that reveal the inside knowledge of the Doge. In reading on, however, one discovers that not all the remainder of the document is a rendition of the Doge's draft. For, after the discussion of Venice's dependence on her commercial exchange with the Visconti State, the speech abruptly relapses into the hostility toward Florence characteristic of the forger's previous insertions;<sup>23</sup> and, simultaneously, the speaker again begins to blunder in his factual assertions. This mood and patent incompetence prevail until the speaker embarks once more upon the statistical examination of Venetian resources,<sup>24</sup> this time in order to produce the final argument: that Venice's revenues from her present territorial state and the expenses for its defense keep an even balance, whereas any advance of the frontier from the hilly Veronese region to the flatter western parts would necessitate a larger army and, consequently, would lead to a permanent drain on the Venetian finance.

But before reaching that last paragraph of the matter-of-fact report, we can indeed have no doubt of being for a while confronted with all the symptoms familiar from earlier interpolations. This intermediary section<sup>25</sup> is recognizable at the outset by new references to the alleged presence of a Florentine delegation waiting for an alliance, and to the legendary law preventing the envoys from the discussion of peace. The legend is brought to its point here by the tale that the ambassadors were eventually

<sup>22</sup> That is, from col. 952B, line 25 onward.

<sup>23</sup> Col. 955, lines 47 ff.

<sup>24</sup> From col. 958, line 23 onward.

<sup>25</sup> Col. 955D, line 47 — col. 958B, line 23.

asked to go home and, before anything else, have their malicious law revoked.

Among erroneous statements, which abound, the following are worth noting. The chronology of the alleged successive Florentine delegations is twisted in such a way that a speech ascribed to Mocenigo falls many months after his death (an implication noted before).<sup>26</sup> A reference to the time about 1400 names Galeazzo Maria, instead of Giangaleazzo, as Lord of Milan. Again we hear that "justice and virtue" are on the side of Filippo Maria, and that "the war is caused by the iniquity of the Florentines, who can have peace but don't want to have it"<sup>27</sup> and pursue the diabolical plan of getting Venice involved in the clash, in order to use Venetian money for conquering other men's property — only to desert the Venetian ally afterwards. Not only is the Doge supposed to talk with this partiality and in these terms of hatred; he also praises himself in a most improper fashion, which clearly has the ring of a retrospective judgment from a later time. "*Sig-nori Veneziani*," he is made to address the Senate, "you have a leader who has virtue and a good heart and has kept you in peace. . . . You will stay happy as long as this leader lives . . ." <sup>28</sup>

The statistical figures in this section belong in two different categories. Most of them do not refer to the actual conditions of the Venetian State at all, but specify the various kinds of produce which may be expected from an ideal, imaginary "*giardino*." Only in two particular cases may we suspect an expert knowledge of the writer, the first being the following assertion. "Your *Collegio* has wished to know all the revenues which we have from Verona to Mestre [the nearest mainland town reached by crossing the lagoon from Venice]. They amount to 464,000 ducats . . . . The revenue is even with the expense . . . . If we went beyond Verona, it would be necessary for us to maintain vast ex-

<sup>26</sup> See above, p. 192.

<sup>27</sup> "La guerra nasce d'iniquità de' Fiorentini, i quali possono aver pace e non la vogliono." Col. 956D.

<sup>28</sup> "... voi avete un Principe di virtù e di bontà, che vi ha tenuto in pace . . . . Beati voi, finchè vivrà questo Principe." Col. 957A-B.

penses . . ." <sup>20</sup> But this apparent display of original information (particularly deceptive because the reference is to the pre-1426 conditions when Verona still was Venice's westernmost bastion) reveals itself as nothing but a condensation of what we read with even more details in the statistics of the Doge in the final section of the speech: "The above listed places yield 464.000 ducats for the 1.000 heavy horsemen whom we have, 3.000 footmen, and 100 archers, who [together] eat up these revenues . . . Consequently, if we went beyond Verona where the country is an open plain, the revenues of our State would not suffice . . . to pay the soldiers whom we should have to maintain." <sup>30</sup> Nor must we be deceived by a second bit of seemingly authentic information, contained in the sentence: "We are fresh and have a [revolving] capital that amounts to about ten million ducats, which earn four million ducats." <sup>31</sup> For this statement can be made by anyone who has read the more explicit statistics of the Doge in the third discourse: "In times of peace our City of Venice sends a capital of ten million ducats through the world with our ships and galleys every year, with the result that we earn through investment alone two million ducats from transportation and two million from import and export, that is, four million ducats altogether." <sup>32</sup>

<sup>20</sup> "Il vostro Collegio ha voluto intendere tutte l'entrate, che abbiamo da Verona per fino a Mestre, le quali sono di Ducati 464000. . . . L'entrata combatte colla spesa. . . . Se noi passassimo di là da Verona, ci converrebbe tenere spesa grande. . ." Col. 956E, lines 64-73.

<sup>30</sup> ". . . i sopradetti luoghi rendono Ducati 464000. per 1000. lance, che abbiamo e per 3000. fanti, e per 100. balestrieri, che mangiano quest' entrate . . . Però se passassimo Verona, per essere campagna aperta, non ci basterebbono l'entrate del nostro Stato . . . a pagare le genti d'arme, che noi tenessimo." Col. 958C-D, lines 36-50.

<sup>31</sup> "Noi siamo freschi, e abbiamo un capitale, che va attorno, di dieci milioni di Ducati, i quali guadagnano quattro milioni di Ducati." Col. 956C, lines 34-37.

<sup>32</sup> "Item per la pace nostra la nostra Città di Venezia manda dieci milioni di capitale ogn' anno per tutto il mondo con navi e Galere, per modo che guadagnano del mettere solamente due milioni di Ducati pel guadagno del condurre, e due milioni tra mettere e traere, che sono quattro milioni di Ducati." Col. 959B, lines 16-23. In the version preserved in the *Cronaca Dolfina*, published in *Bilanci Generali* (see Chapter IX, section 1, note 4),

After these observations we may say that even in the study of the more complicated structure of the second discourse the criteria at our command are sufficient for distinguishing the forger's hand from the original draft of the Doge. The pith of our findings is that, fortunately, Mocenigo's address was not so much adulterated in details difficult to detect, as preserved in two large and compound sections fitted into the frame of the later forgery.

#### 4. THE FORGER, HIS BIAS, AND THE DATE OF THE FALSIFICATION

There remains one question, which, in the interest of final certitude, must always be asked where falsification of an historical document is assumed: can we identify the circumstances motivating the forgery? For this ultimate check, too, the established criteria provide reliable foundations.

We may start with a promising clue found in the third document of Mocenigo's copybook. Although the last discourse<sup>1</sup> is mostly a factual account that works up statistical data and may be thought to have suffered few alterations,<sup>2</sup> one case of interference by the redactor stands out at the beginning. The Doge opens his deathbed address in this solemn way: "*Signori*, we have sent for you after God's will has given us this illness which will end our pilgrimage. We reverently invoke the omnipotence of God the Father, God the Son, and the Holy Spirit, *who is one God in three persons, and one of the three persons adopted human flesh, and this was the Son, according to the doctrine of our preacher Messer Frate Antonio dalla Massa*; to this God triune

---

p. 95, this passage reads: "Item per esser nui in paxe, questa nostra età manda ai trafegi X milliona de ducatti de cavedal per tutto el mondo, tra cum nave, gallie et altri navilij, per mu[o]do chel guadagno del metter si è do milliona de ducati, el guadagno del condui in Venexia si è do milliona, et tra el metter e trazer si è 4 milliona."

<sup>1</sup> Sanudo, col. 958E — col. 960D.

<sup>2</sup> For instance, col. 959C, line 37 — line 45 (in the version of the *Cronaca Dolfina*, ed. in *Bilanci Generali*, p. 95, line 36 — p. 96, line 3) might be an intrusion.



we are indebted for many reasons, which we will enumerate . . ."<sup>3</sup> It is obvious that the words put in italics represent a formal confession of faith and a reference to personal experience, such as have a false ring in a Doge's address to his political associates. The same conclusion seems to have imposed itself on an earlier student of the document.<sup>4</sup> The text reads smoothly after the italicized portion is removed.<sup>5</sup>

Here we have a case in which it is not difficult to grasp the reason why an insertion was made. Obviously, some unknown admirer of Frate Antonio dalla Massa (Minister General of the Franciscan order from 1424 to 1430, and in 1422 appointed "Apostolic preacher" by Pope Martin V)<sup>6</sup> wished to honor him by giving an illustration of his influence on the Doge although the Franciscan had visited Venice only briefly on a diplomatic mission. Presumably, therefore, the adapter of the deathbed speech was himself a Franciscan (possibly a friar who was in touch with the public documents in the chancery or the archives). Or he may have been a person whose ideas were molded by the outlook of the order whose constant advocacy of peace is so significant a trait in the period of the Renaissance. Since there is

<sup>3</sup> "Signori, abbiamo mandato per voi, dopo che Iddio ci ha voluto dare questa infermità, la quale sarà il fine del nostro pellegrinare. Invocando celeberrimamente l'Onnipotenza d'Iddio Padre, Figliuolo, e Spirito Santo, *ch'è un Dio in tre persone, e una delle tre Persone prese carne umana, che fu il Figliuolo, secondo la dottrina del nostro Predicatore Messer Frate Antonio dalla Massa*; al qual Dio Trino e Uno siamo obligati per molte ragioni, che noi tocheremo . . ." Col. 958E.

<sup>4</sup> That is, Kretschmayr, who, in reproducing the version edited in the *Bilanci Generali* (see note 5), omitted almost the same words, making an ellipsis in the print. *Geschichte von Venedig*, II, 617.

<sup>5</sup> The version in the *Cronaca Dolfina* (ed. in *Bilanci Generali*, pp. 94-95), by repeating the words *Spirito Sancto*, seems to show the intrusion even more clearly: "Signori. Havemo mandado per tutti vui dapuò che Dio ha voluto darne questa malatia ne la qual sarà la fin del peregrinazo nostro, laudando summamente la omnipotentia de Dio Spirito Sancto, *che è uno Dio Padre, et de Dio Fiolo ed de Dio Spirito Sancto, ch'è uno Dio in tre persone, prese carne humana, che fu il Fiolo secondo la dottrina del nostro predicator messer frate Antonio dala Massa*. Al qual Dio Trino siamo obligati per molte rason. Nui tocheremo . . ."

<sup>6</sup> See R. M. Huber, O.F.M., *A Documented History of the Franciscan Order* (Washington, D.C., 1944), pp. 328 ff.

no reason to suppose that the hand which altered the third discourse was different from the one which forged the first and adulterated the second, we shall no longer find it so surprising that the second discourse, with its mixture of emotional appeals to peacefulness and political hatred, reads in some parts like the popular sermon of a friar preacher.

Can we determine the occasion during the war against Filippo Maria on which this violent scorn of Florence may have developed?

A key is found in one of our earlier observations. The long excursus in the second discourse which is characterized by a strongly biblical hue originated, as we know, more than 1008 years after 421, that is, later than 1429-30.<sup>7</sup> Now, this chronology is in harmony with the fact that the redactor does not only know of the actual outbreak of the Florentine-Milanese war (in the year after Mocenigo's death),<sup>8</sup> but also shows a knowledge of the war events throughout the 1420's.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, many of the reproaches against Florence, which at an earlier time would have been pure calumny, had a factual basis during the half-decade following 1429-30. In 1429 Florence was entering upon the fateful war against Lucca which by 1434 was to bring about the downfall of Florence's ruling group and the rise of Cosimo de' Medici to power. Although this war was motivated by Lucca's secret coöperation with Filippo Maria, Florence's decision to put an end to the independence of one of the major Tuscan city-republics placed her on a path of conquest that had been foreign to Florentine politics in the preceding decades, with the one exception of the occupation of the vital seaport, Pisa. As a consequence, the Florentine Republic, which had accepted the challenge by Giangaleazzo and Filippo Maria Visconti with unanimous energy, was from 1429 onward sharply divided into champions and adversaries of the Lucca venture; and during the same period the public finances nearly broke down under the strain

<sup>7</sup> See above, p. 204.

<sup>8</sup> See above, p. 200.

<sup>9</sup> First seen by Romanin, *Storia Documentata*, IV, 92.

of the new war.<sup>10</sup> Among those who endeavored to restrain Florence from hostilities was Niccolò da Uzzano. In the days of Giangaleazzo Visconti and King Ladislaus of Naples, and still on the eve of the struggle with Filippo Maria, Uzzano had been among the determined adversaries of a policy of compromise.<sup>11</sup> In 1429 and 1430 he was the leader of the opposition against the party responsible for war. His spectacular speech for peace, found in the narratives of later Florentine historians,<sup>12</sup> may be a subsequent humanistic invention, since there are no traces of it in simultaneous documents; but it reflects the impression which he made at that time on his contemporaries. We have the testimony of the coeval historian, Giovanni Cavalcanti, to the effect that "the entire party of the Uzzano-followers" (*tutta la parte Uzzanesca*) publicly called the Lucca war an "unjust" enterprise and predicted that Providence would turn it into disaster, as had happened with other unjust wars.<sup>13</sup>

When seen against this background, the workings of the mind of Moccenigo's redactor, as well as the time of his revision, emerge from their twilight. The latest episode of Florentine history, which in the redactor's eyes overshadowed the past, was the attack on Lucca. Already one sees, he says, that the Florentines, ever since they began to desire their neighbors' possessions and wage war, "have been reduced to poverty and live in discord. One behaved overbearingly toward the other. Like tyrants, one expelled the other, one had the other killed."<sup>14</sup> All this can only refer either to the expulsion of Cosimo de' Medici and his group in August 1433 or to the conflicts and expulsion of their adver-

<sup>10</sup> The best description of this situation, based on the archival material available, is in F. C. Pellegrini, *Sulla Repubblica Fiorentina a Tempo di Cosimo il Vecchio* (Pisa, 1889), pp. 18 ff.

<sup>11</sup> See Chapter IX, section 3, note 7.

<sup>12</sup> See the detailed anti-war speech of 1429 attributed to Uzzano in Scipione Ammirato, *Istorie Fiorentine*, lib. XIX; in the edition Florence, 1647, pp. 1053 f.

<sup>13</sup> Giovanni Cavalcanti, *Istorie Fiorentine*, lib. VI cap. VI, in the edition Florence, 1838, I, 303 f., 306; in the edition Milan, 1945, pp. 164, 165.

<sup>14</sup> "... sono impoveriti e stanno divisi. Uno soverchiava l'altro. Come Tiranni uno cacciava l'altro, uno fece uccidere l'altro." Sanudo, col. 952B.

saries on Cosimo's return, in 1434. Consequently, the redactor must have done his work in 1433 or 1434 or shortly afterwards.

In April 1433 the war between the Venetian-Florentine League and Filippo Maria was composed, for a brief period, by the so-called second peace of Ferrara. Two months later, Francesco Foscari made an attempt to resign from the office of Doge; he was tired of the bitter opposition aroused by his policy of war against Milan and by the ensuing financial straits.<sup>15</sup> His abdication was refused by the responsible officers; and by August 1434 hostilities had been resumed because Filippo Maria had violated the recent peace by penetrating into the Papal possessions in the Romagna: a repetition of the events of 1423.<sup>16</sup> The necessity of the alliance with Florence and of the war with Milan was thus proved anew, and for some time afterward we do not hear any more of any opposition to Foscari's politics of concerted action against Milan.

The period in the history of Venice, then, during which a denunciation of Florence's warlike attitude and a warning against Venetian participation in the war would seem most appropriate are the months which preceded and followed Foscari's attempt to abdicate under the pressure of opposition to his policy of war. In any case, one may conclude that the forgery was made before the trend of Milanese expansion was again in full evidence, that is, not later than the autumn of 1434.<sup>17</sup> When to this inference is added the fact that the redactor was familiar with at least the first of the contemporaneous Florentine revolutions, the expulsion of Cosimo in August 1433, his forgery may be dated between September 1433 and August 1434.

Looking back from that period, and bitterly criticizing the course of events in the first phase of the Florentine-Venetian fight against Filippo Maria, the forger oddly confused the pre-

<sup>15</sup> See Romanin, *Storia Documentata*, IV, 170; Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, II, 344.

<sup>16</sup> See Romanin, *Storia*, IV, 178; F.-T. Perrens, *Histoire de Florence jusqu'à la domination des Médicis*, VI (Paris, 1883), 410 f.

<sup>17</sup> The middle of the 1430's as the *terminus ad quem* is also suggested by the forger's intent to honor Antonio della Massa Marittima (see above, p. 209); for Antonio died in 1435.

war conditions of 1422-23, the time of Mocenigo's speeches, with the fresh experiences on the eve of the Lucca enterprise. He knew of Uzzano's recent advocacy of peace, and so he ventured to ascribe to him the same rôle in the fictitious story with which he framed Mocenigo's records. Because Florence had waged an aggressive war against Lucca, she had also been the aggressor in Mocenigo's period. The violent anti-Florentine feeling of the forger's own day was read into the history of the events which originally had caused the Florentine clash with Filippo Maria.

#### 5. THE SOURCE VALUE OF THE GENUINE PARTS OF THE DISCOURSES

We shall conclude with a word on the significance of our findings.

It is a matter of course that in the case of so unscrupulous a falsification as the one detected no *aquafortis* would be able to separate every single word of Mocenigo from every single word added, or altered, by the forger. There may be minor interpolations even in the portions preserved essentially intact from Mocenigo's records; it is possible (and we may hope) that further studies will gradually disclose such minor changes. But this possibility does not detract from the value of a macroscopic differentiation between the parts adopted from Mocenigo's legacy and the totally fictitious framework put around this nucleus. This much, at least, we may learn from our large-scale analysis:

The passionate hatred of the Florentine Republic that pervades the discourses of Tommaso Mocenigo in the version handed down to us is the outpouring of an obscure redactor and stems from the tangled days of the Lucca war. This means that Mocenigo's records do not refute the conclusion which we should draw from our other sources of information: that the keen hostility between the Florentine and Venetian republics, well known to have existed in later Renaissance Italy, did not yet prevail in the early Renaissance when the keynote of the Florentine and, eventually, the Venetian political attitude was still a friendly sentiment be-

tween the *populi liberi* in Italy.<sup>1</sup> The motive which turned Venice in the first two decades of the Quattrocento against practical coöperation with Florence was not any anti-Florentine bias in favor of Viscontean Milan, but an isolationist attitude which refused to acknowledge the existence of a mutual interdependence among the members of the rising Italian states-system and fostered the inclination to look upon economic prosperity as an advantage that Venice could preserve by abstaining from political entanglements on the *terra ferma*. Not until the start of the Milanese expansion in the time of Filippo Maria was the fallacy of these apparently sound and businesslike calculations demonstrated. Accordingly, it is also important to note from our critical study of Mocenigo's records that the historic struggle between two schools of Venetian statesmanship did not take place as early as January 1421 (as the *consensus* has long held), but during the second half of the year 1422, when Italy began to sense the meaning of the renewed pressure from the Visconti.

Finally, we are now able to escape the misleading literary impression which Mocenigo's speeches in their dressed-up form were liable to make as long as they could pose as coming from the pen of a Venetian Doge. Even in the latest edition of V. Rossi's fundamental handbook on the Italian literature of the Quattrocento we read that the discourses of Mocenigo, composed "in 1421," reveal an oratory which, in the midst of practical considerations, "from time to time rises to a mighty, almost biblical, solemnity, . . . an example of political eloquence that seems to have no parallel in the fifteenth century."<sup>2</sup> After the present

<sup>1</sup>For the role of this early Quattrocento republicanism in Florentine-Venetian relations, and for the difference in the political climate between the first and the second half of the century, see "A Struggle for Liberty," pp. 562 ff., 567 ff., and *Crisis*, chapter 16, section "*Populi Liberi*: Florence and Venice Against the Visconti from the 1420's to the 1440's."

<sup>2</sup>"... quando nel 1421 tonava contro il partito capitanato da Francesco Foscari . . . , assurgente di quando in quando a una terribile, quasi biblica solennità, . . . lasciò un esempio d'eloquenza politica, che forse non ha pari nel secolo XV." Rossi, *Il Quattrocento*, 3rd ed. (reprinted Milan, 1945), p. 152. The effect of Rossi's verdict is seen in the article on Tommaso

analysis of these documents we need not search far for the reasons why the alleged speeches of the Doge Mocenigo are different from everything otherwise known about the political oratory of the Quattrocento. With the distinction between the original core and the forged frame at which we have arrived we need no longer grope in the dark when dealing with problems whose solution hinges on Mocenigo's speeches.

---

Mocenigo in the *Enciclopedia Italiana* (vol. XXIII [1934], col. 502); there Mocenigo is presented as a "bell' esempio di eloquenza politica," while reference is made to Rossi's *Il Quattrocento*.





- Bruni, Leonardo (Aretino), *cont.*  
 scripts 128, 129-153; editions  
 128; and *Laudatio* 75-76, 78, 80-  
 82, 94-97, 120, 126; and Trans.  
 of *Economics* 11, 166, 169-170  
 — *Laudatio* 9, 38, 69-108, 127-128;  
 date 39, 70, 71, 75-76, 82-84, 93,  
 97-98, 103, 114-116, 120-122, 125,  
 126, 164-165; title 95-97, 151;  
 manuscripts 69-70, 80, 96, edition  
 69-70, and *Dialogi* 75, 76,  
 78, 80-82, 94-97, 126; and *Epist.*  
*Descript. of Flor. Constitution*  
 11, 173, 175, 181; and *Paradiso*  
 18, 20; and Salutati's *Invectiva*  
 88, 98-103, 105-106; and Verge-  
 rio's *Ep. LXXXVI* 107-108, 113  
 — *Epist. Description of Flor. Con-*  
*stitution* 11, 173-184; date 180-  
 181; manuscript 173-174, edition  
 181-184; and *Laudatio* 11, 173,  
 175, 181  
 — Correspondence 72-74, 119-120;  
 its chronology 70-71; editions  
 71, 162; *Epistola I* 115; *Ep. II* 4  
 74, 111; *Ep. V* 2 169, 170; *Ep.*  
*VIII* 4 72, 87, 97; *Ep. X* 3 162;  
*Ep. XI* 1 115; *Ep. of Sept.* 13,  
 1405 73; official letters 1432-33:  
 176  
 — *Epistola I* 8 72-73, 76, 81-82, 116-  
 120, 121; date 73, 83, 84, 96-97,  
 98, 104, 114-117, 120-123, 126  
 — Trans. of *Phaedon* 10, 72, 82, 118,  
 120-121, 160, 163; date 84, 98,  
 104, 114-116, 118-122, 125  
 — Annotated Trans. of "*Economics*"  
 11, 151, 166-172; composition and  
 date 168-171; manuscripts 167-  
 168; and *Dialogi* 11, 166, 169-170  
 — Trans. of Basilus' *Homilia* 117-  
 118, 160; of Xenophon's *Hieron*  
 117-118; of Plutarch's *Vita De-*  
*mosthenis* 143; of Plato's *Phae-*  
*drus* 118  
 — *Historiae Flor. Populi* 85-86, 101,  
 133, 163, 165; *Rer. Suo Tempore*  
*Gest. Commentarius* 86, 117,  
 175-177, *On the "Politica" of the*  
*Florentines* 178; "*Oratio Fune-*  
*bris*" *on Strozzi* 181; *Oratio apud*  
*Imperatorem* 176-177  
 Bueno De Mesquita, D. M.:  
*see* De Mesquita  
 Burckhardt, J. 187  
 Burgundy, Duke John of 143  
 Caesar 19, 29-31, 100-101, 132  
 Calò, G. 31  
 Cammelli, G. 109, 110  
 Campana, A. 121, 141, 147, 153  
 Capponi, Gino (historian) 64  
 Carrara, Lords of Padua 4, 28, 41,  
 47, 52, 53, 54; *see also* Padua  
 Casalechio 86  
 Casari, C. 32  
 Cavalcanti, Giovanni 211  
 Cessi, R. 187  
 Chrysoloras, Manuel 10, 107-111,  
 117, 118, 122, 156  
 Cicero 19, 22-23, 33, 121-122, 151, 182  
 Claudianus 30  
 Constance, Council of 135-145, 152,  
 154, 176, 177, 179, 180  
 Constantinople 110-111  
 Conversino (da Ravenna), Giovanni  
 119-121, 122, 124  
 Cortona 64, 67  
 Cremona 176-177, 179-181  
 Dalmatia 194  
 Dante 4, 127, 132-133, 134, 136, 159  
 Dante lectureship at the Florentine  
 University 36, 37  
 Da Schio, G. 39, 40, 43-46  
 Dati, Gregorio 61-63, 64-65, 90  
 — *Istoria* 11, 45, 47, 62-68, 165; date  
 63, 67, 68; editions 63-64  
 Dati, Lionardo 195  
 Datini, Francesco 155  
 Decembrio, Pier Candido 72, 84  
 De Franco, E. 94  
 Della Torre, A. 15  
 De Mesquita, D. M. Bueno 41-42  
 Di Giovanni, M. 17  
 Diodorus 161

- Di Pierro, C. 86  
Doren, A. 188, 191  
Dugumaro, Paulo 17  
Ellinwood, L. 49  
Empire, ancient: *see* Rome —  
    medieval German 6, 20  
Ercole, F. 133  
Este, Marquises of Ferrara 41, 47, 53,  
    54; *see also* Ferrara  
Etruria: *see* Tuscany  
Fabricius, J. A. (*Bibliotheca Graeca*),  
    171  
Fazio, Bartolommeo 133, 153  
Ferrara 21; *see also* Este  
Filelfo, Francesco 174  
Fillastre, Guillaume, Cardinal 135-  
    140, 141, 143-145  
Flamini, F. 39  
Flaminia (province) 90-91  
Florence  
— Theory of foundation by republic-  
    can Rome 18-24, 27-31, 33, 78,  
    99-104  
— Florentine constitution in con-  
    temporary writings 11, 63-65,  
    68, 107-108, 112-113, 173, 178-  
    179, 181-184  
— Foreign policy 6-7, 27-28, 40, 43-  
    48, 53-58, 66-68, 88-90, 104-106,  
    176-177, 188-189, 190-196, 200-  
    202, 210-211  
— Florence and *libertas* in Italy 4-7,  
    10, 25, 56-62, 76-78, 90-93, 164,  
    185, 198, 212-214  
— Humanists and political writers:  
    Chapters I-VIII, *passim*  
Florus 22-23  
Forlì 200  
Foscari, Francesco, Doge of Venice  
    190, 192, 196, 197, 201, 203, 204,  
    212  
France (French King) 41, 42, 47-48,  
    53, 57, 105-106  
Friuli 194  
Gaddi, Angelo 69, 96  
Galletti, G. C. 31, 178  
Garin, E. 51, 128, 172  
Gaspary, A. 16-17  
Gauls: *see* France  
Genoa 203  
Germany  
— *See* Rupert, German King, and  
    Sigismund, Emperor  
— Imperial Chancery 135-136, 139,  
    140  
Gherardi, Giovanni: *see* Prato, Gio-  
    vanni (Gherardi) da  
Gonzaga, Lords (later, Marquises)  
    of Mantua 41, 45, 47, 53, 54, 195,  
    196; Francesco 46, 57; *see also*  
    Mantua  
Governolo 54, 105  
Greece  
— Ancient Greece, and Greek  
    studies 10, 108-109, 112, 114,  
    117-124, 160-161, 171-172  
— Greece and Byzantium 108-110,  
    172  
Gregory the Great 133-134, 150  
Gregory XII, Pope 110-112  
Guarino da Verona 143  
Guasti, C. 34, 193  
Guelphs (Guelphism) 6, 57, 78, 80,  
    89, 99  
Hauréau, B. 167, 171-172  
Henricpetri, publisher 129-130  
Homer 168  
Innocent VII, Pope 98, 110, 119  
Italy: *see* Florence and "*libertas*" in  
    Italy; Venice and "*libertas*" in  
    Italy; Visconti, Dukes of Milan;  
    and *passim*  
*Itinerarium Provinciarum Antonini*  
*Augusti* 143  
John XXIII, Pope 139, 152, 176, 179,  
    180  
Kirner, G. 75-76, 77, 80, 94-95, 106-  
    107, 128, 129, 148, 155-156  
Klette, Th. 39, 69-70, 71, 128, 129,  
    130, 148, 155

## Index

- Klibansky, R. 121  
 Kretschmayr, H. 187, 190, 209  
 Kristeller, P. O. 51, 131, 153, 182
- Lactantius 182  
 Ladislaus, King of Naples 7, 66-67, 199, 211  
 Landini, Francesco 33, 49-50  
 Lanza-nichi (villa) 81, 116-117  
*Laudatio Leonardi historici et oratoris* (anonymous) 96, 146  
 Leghorn (Livorno) 67  
 Lehmann, P. 152  
 Lehnerdt, M. 14, 29, 71  
 Livy 22, 143  
 Lodi 176-177, 179-181  
 Loschi, Antonio 38  
 — *Invectiva in Florentinos* 9, 40-47, 48, 49, 51, 53, 55, 56, 57, 102, 106; date 39-42, 45, 46, 47, 60, 164-165; edition 51  
 Lucca 44, 77-78, 87-88, 176-177, 210-211, 213  
 Luiso, F. P. 69-70, 74, 76, 77, 83-87, 93-95, 107, 115-117, 119, 122-123, 162  
 Luzzatti, L. 186-187  
 Luzzatto, G. 187
- Malatesta, Carlo 54  
 Malespina, Leonardo, Marchese 153  
 Manetti, Giannozzo 20, 70, 96, 146, 148-149, 150, 151, 153  
 Manni, G. 64  
 Mantua 42, 49, 91, 195; *see also* Gonzaga  
 Mantuan War 6, 42, 44, 57, 85, 87  
 Marchi, Angelo 173-174  
 Marius 22  
 Marsili, Luigi 16, 18-21, 24, 26, 27, 29-30, 32, 155  
 Marsilio di Santa Sofia 16, 33  
 Martin V, Pope 195, 209  
 Martin, K. 147  
 Massa, Antonio dalla, Frate 208-209, 212  
 Mazzei, Lapo 155  
 Medici, Cosimo de' 167-172, 210-212, Lorenzo de' (brother Cosimo's) 157  
 Meh-us, L. 20, 71, 116  
 Mercati, Giovanni, Cardinal 142  
 Mestre 206  
 Milan  
 — Under Visconti. *see* Visconti  
 — As a Republic 7  
 — Humanists and political writers 7-9, *see also* Loschi, "Invectiva in Florentinos"  
 Minio-Paluello, L. 121  
 Mocenigo, Tommaso, Doge of Venice 185, 188-189, 192-193, 195-197, 214-215  
 — *Anti-Florentine Discourses* 10, 185-215; composition and date 190, 196-197, 201, 204-205, 208, 213, 214, 215, date of falsification 211-213; manuscripts and editions 185-187  
 Mommsen, Th. E. 148, 155  
 Monnier, P. 15  
 Monticolo, G. 186  
 Moreni, D. 51
- Naples, Kingdom of 7, 67, 195, *see also* Ladislaus, King of Naples  
 Niccoli, Niccolò 20, 73-74, 75, 81-82, 116-117, 127, 157-158, 159, 165, 174  
 Nicolaus V, Pope 161  
 Nogara, B. 141, 142, 144  
 Novati, F. 17, 21, 29, 39, 40, 43-46, 50, 52, 56, 58, 122-124  
 Nuremberg 130-131
- Occamism 33  
 Olver, R. P. 119  
 Olschki, L. 15-16  
 Or San Michele, Church in Florence 35  
 Orsini, Giovanni, Cardinal 138-140, 141-145
- Padua 6, 91, 110, 111, 119, 124, 131, 133, 135, 136, 139; *see also* Cararra

- Papacy (Papal State): *see* Rome  
 Pastine, L. 40  
 Pavia 46  
 Pavia, Truce of 6, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 48, 51, 53, 54, 55, 57  
 Pelacani, Biagio 33  
 Perrens, F.-T. 58, 212  
 Perugia 44, 87-88, 177  
 Petraglione, G. 84  
 Petrarch 24, 25, 127, 134, 136, 159  
 Piacenza 175-176, 179, 180  
 Piccolomini, Enca Silvio 133-136, 140  
 Pietro di ser Mino [di Lorenzo Serminii] da Montevarchi 95, 97, 112, 161-163  
 Pisa 6, 43-46, 65-66, 67-68, 74, 77, 87-88, 189, 202-203, 210  
 Pistoia 117  
 Plato 10, 82, 114, 116, 118, 163  
 — *Timaeus* trans. and com. by Chalcidius 119-121, 123-124; *Phaedon* trans. by Aristippus 119-121, 122-124, by Bruni 10, 82, 98, 104, 114-116, 119-121, 160; *Phaedrus* trans. by Bruni 118  
 Pliny the Elder 19, 21-22  
 Plutarch 143  
 Pöhlmann, R. von 187-188  
 Poggio Bracciolini 20, 96, 146, 150, 157-159, 161  
 Poland 138, 152  
 Polybius 87  
 Porcari, Stefano 133  
 Po valley 4, 28  
 Pratesi, L. 63-64, 65-66  
 Prato (town) 36, 37  
 Prato, Giovanni (Gherardi) da 13-14, 16-17, 26-27, 28-29, 31-32, 34-37  
 — *Paradiso* 8, 13-37, 38, 163-164; date 13-17, 31, 32-34, 37, 60-61; edition 13; and Salutati's *Invectiva* 16, 19-24, 26, 28, and Rinuccini's *Risponsiva* 21, 25-27, 28; and *Laudatio* 18, 20  
 Ptolemy 19, 22  
 Ptolemy of Lucca 24, 133  
 Raulich, F. 194  
 Ravenna 177  
 Reichenau Abbey Library 138, 147  
 Reims Cathedral Library 137, 144, 145  
 Rimini 177  
 Rinuccini, Cino 50-51, 54  
 — *Risponsiva* 9, 21, 38, 47-50, 51, 53-54; date 39, 48-49, 60, 164-165; manuscripts 26, 50; edition 51; and *Paradiso* 21, 25-27, 28  
 — *Invettiva Against Slanderers of Dante* 27, 39  
 Robert, King of Naples 26  
 Romagna 199, 200, 212  
 Romanin, S. 187, 194, 196  
 Rome  
 — Interpretations of ancient Rome. *Respublica Romana* 17-18, 20-21, 24-26, 27-28, 30, 38, 99-100, 128, 133; Emperors 18, 21, 30, 38, 78, 80, 99-100, 132-133  
 — Papacy and Papal State 6, 109-111, 124, 176, 195  
 — Roman Curia and Humanism 104, 110-111, 117, 122, 133, 139, 150, 155, 158-162, 178-180  
 Rome, Basilica di S Pietro Library 141-143  
 Rose, V. 171  
 Rossi, Roberto de' 20, 94-95, 127, 157  
 Rossi, V. 15, 29, 34, 40, 155, 188, 191, 214-215  
 Rubinstein, N. 17, 51  
 Rupert of the Palatinate, German King 6, 45, 89  
 Rustici, Cencio de' 142, 143, 144  
 Sabbadini, R. 69, 74, 84, 93-97, 115-117, 121-122, 124  
 Saitta, G. 15  
 Sallust 19, 22-24  
 Salutati, Coluccio  
 — Salutati and Filippo Villani 30-31; and Giovanni da Prato 32, 50-51; and Rinuccini 50-51, 54; and Vergerio 107; and Poggio 157-159; and Bruni 73, 75, 81-82,

- Salutati, Coluccio, *cont.*  
 95-97, 107, 123, 127, 160-161; and the translations of *Phaedon* by Aristippus and Bruni 117-124; Salutati's circle 156-159, 162; his chancery successors 112, 162
- Historical criticism (foundation of Florence) 21-24, 100-101; Salutati versus Occamism 33; the year 1402: 60, 165
- *Invectiva* 9, 42, 43-46, 51-60, 100-102, 106, 160; date 39-40, 51-52, 56, 59-61, 98, 101-102, 164-165; edition 51; and *Paradiso* 16, 19-21, 24, 26, 28; and *Laudatio* 88, 98-103, 105-106
- *De Tyranno* 132-133, 165; *De Laboribus Herculis* 160-161
- Correspondence 21, 72, 119, 123; *Ep. X* 23 21-22; *Ep. XI* 11 124; *Ep. XII* 21 123; *Ep. XII* 24 120-121; *Ep. XIII* 8 23, *Ep. XIII* 10 102; *Ep. XIV* 10 42, 46-47, 160; *Ep. XIV* 17 73, 96
- *Ep. XII* 10 119-120, 122-125; date 122-123, 124
- Salvi, Alessandro di 193, 197
- Santini, E. 16, 96, 101
- Sanudo, Marin 185-186, 192-193
- Scaligeri, Lords of Verona 4, 28, 52; *see also* Verona
- Scaramella, G. 44
- Schedel, Hartmann 131, 133, 135, 136
- Schedel, Hermann 131, 147
- Seneca 33, 150
- Sermini, Pietro: *see* Pietro di ser Mino
- Sicily (Sicilian grain) 45
- Siena 44, 67
- Sigismund, Emperor 139, 175-177, 179-181, 192-194, 196
- Smith, L. 107-113, 139
- Solerti, A. 30
- Sozomeno di Pistoia 146
- Strauber, R. 131
- Stradino's MS. of Dati's *Istoria* 63-64
- Sulla 18, 19, 22, 23, 30, 100-101
- Tacitus 38, 100
- Thompson, J. W. 188
- Todi 177
- Traversari, Ambrogio 17
- Trent 135
- Treviso 117
- Turchi, Pietro 102
- Turks 110
- Tuscany, Etruria
- Etruria 18, 27
- Tuscany 4, 42, 65, 67, 89-91, 106
- Ullman, B. L. 121, 161
- Umbria 177
- Uzzano, Niccolò da 199, 200, 211, 213
- Valeri, N. 8, 40
- Valla, Lorenzo 72
- Vasoli, C. 33
- Venice
- Foreign policy 6-7, 91, 188-189, 194-195, 202-204, 212
- Venice and *libertas* in Italy 7, 10, 25, 185, 201, 213-214
- Humanists and political writers 8, 110, 185, 188, 214-215
- *See also* Foscari, Francesco, Doge, and Mocenigo, Tommaso, Doge
- Venice, Peace of 44, 51, 55, 59, 85, 89, 91, 104-105
- Vergerio, Pier Paolo 107-108, 111-113, 127, 129, 139-140, 154, 155-157, 169
- *Epistola LXXXXVI* 107-113; date 108, 112-113; and the *Laudatio* 108, 113
- Verme, Jacopo del 54
- Verona 6, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207; *see also* Scaligeri
- Villani, Filippo 17, 30-31, 100
- Visconti, Dukes of Milan, Giangaleazzo 4-6, 28, 33, 40-41, 43-47, 89-90, 98, 120, 164, 199, 210-211; in Salutati's *Invectiva* 42, 52-59; in Bruni's *Laudatio* 71-72, 75-79, 84-88, 90-93, 99, 107; in Salutati's and Bruni's propaganda

- 
- 104-106; in Dati's *Istoria* 67-68, 165  
— Filippo Maria 7, 33, 72, 90, 192, 194-195, 198-200, 210-214; cited in the speeches attributed to Mocenigo 186-187, 190, 202, 203, 206  
— Gabriello Maria, son of Giangaleazzo 65-66  
— "Galeazzo Maria" 206  
Viterbo 73, 159-161  
Vittorini, D. 155  
Viviani, U. 23  
Voigt, G. 14-15, 39, 71, 116, 150  
Volterra 77-78, 174  
Walser, E. 15, 115  
Wesselofsky, A. 13-14, 16-17, 19, 27, 29, 32, 49, 71, 116  
Wotke, K. 128, 129  
Xenophon 117-118  
Zippel, G. 40, 116, 173